

First Lt. Other Franklin Speaker, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 14, 1943.

First Lt. Joseph Raymond Henry, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 15, 1943.

First Lt. Walton Merideth Edwards, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 15, 1943.

First Lt. George Vernon Potter, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 15, 1943.

First Lt. Harold Leslie Robinson, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 19, 1943.

First Lt. William Todd DeVan, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 21, 1943.

First Lt. John Philip Harney, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. Harvey George Tousignant, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. James Howard Smith, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. Vernon David Pettit, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. John Nicholas Furst, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. Lee Frank Ferrell, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. John Lynch Dixon, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from October 24, 1943.

First Lt. Walter Anthony Butkus, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from October 24, 1943.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Walter Davis Vail, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Clement John Gaynor, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Walter Andrew Rose, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Alvin Ellsworth Anthony, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Burns Caldwell, Dental Corps, with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Lewis Walter Maly, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Glover Johns, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Leslie Dean Baskin, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Dell Stuart Gray, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. William B. Stewart, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Boyd Lee Smith, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Avery Giles Holmes, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. George Robert Kennebeck, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Joseph Lyon Boyd, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Richard Foster Thompson, Dental Corps, with rank from October 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. William Swann Shuttleworth, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from October 19, 1943.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) John Oscar Lindquist, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from October 10, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Frank Meredith Thompson, United States Army, with rank from October 10, 1943.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Joseph Burt Webster, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from October 11, 1943.

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Alfred Cookman Oliver, Jr., United States Army, with rank from October 24, 1943, subject to examination required by law.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 1 (legislative day, September 15), 1943:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Elvin Seibert to be consul of the United States of America.

John W. Bailey, Jr., to be Foreign Service officer of class 3, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

Wesley A. Simmer, Blanca.
Victor C. Baker, Fairplay.
Roxie R. Broad, Wheat Ridge.

CONNECTICUT

Francis H. Whelan, Darien.
Arthur H. Forst, Seymour.
Paul F. Cassidy, Woodbury.

DELAWARE

Alexander P. Gallagher, New Castle.

GEORGIA

Ola H. Bradbury, Bogart.
Clarence L. Persons, Eastman.
Frances Catherine Wingate, Ellijay.
John Marcus Stubbs, Savannah.
Annie Lee Baker, Shannan.
Eloise G. Flanders, Swainsboro.

INDIANA

Charles E. Hull, Columbus.
Flossie L. Waterstraat, Earl Park.
Closs D. Samuels, Greensburg.
Ethel Williams, Odon.

MASSACHUSETTS

James H. Monahan, Clifton.
Wilma L. Foster, Hamilton.
Bertha S. Nelson, Raynham.

MONTANA

Allen S. McKenzie, Phillipsburg.

NEW MEXICO

Robert F. Fisher, Cuba.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edgar M. Martin, East Bend.
James C. Swain, Plymouth.
Gertrude B. Speir, Winterville.

OKLAHOMA

James E. Terrell, Elmore City.

VERMONT

Mary A. Keleher, Bethel.
Earle J. Rogers, Cabot.
Gertrude L. Cutler, Cambridge.
Hollis S. Johnson, Castleton.
Rutherford D. Pfennig, Forest Dale.
Harriette R. Wilson, Grennsboro.
William T. Johnson, Hardwick.
Frank J. Donahue, Middlebury.
Mabel R. Turner, Rupert.
Ruth A. Randall, Wells River.
Ruby C. Gauthier, Wilder.
Margaret M. Flower, Woodstock.

VIRGINIA

Carrie F. Patterson, Greenwood.
Lexie M. Van Dyke, Jewell Ridge.
Harris Hill Gee, Meherrin.

WISCONSIN

Harold C. Krentz, Westfield.

SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth amid the tragedy of a broken world, in deep humility of spirit at noonday we ascend the altar stairs of this hallowed temple of our faith and hope. Before we talk of the Nation's good we would lift our needy hearts to the nations' God. For in Thee we trust. When for this dedicated moment we blot out all but Thee in a world of rising and falling empires, we crave the strengthening vista of Thine eternal kingdom whose sun never sets.

Give unto us that greatness of spirit which shall match the vast patterns of this creative day. Save us from setting narrow limits upon our responsibility to our fellow men. May no pettiness in our patriotism rob us of the habitual vision of greatness. May we never hesitate when the choice is between honor and calculation. Beyond the strategy of war may we see the depth and scope of this historic drama of the centuries, and may that vision turn its blood and sweat and tears into glory. We ask it in the ever-blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, October 1, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Davis	McCarran
Andrews	Eastland	McClellan
Austin	Ellender	McFarland
Bailey	Ferguson	McKellar
Ball	George	McNary
Barbour	Gerry	Maloney
Barkley	Gillette	Maybank
Brooks	Green	Millikin
Buck	Guffey	Moore
Burton	Gurney	Murdoch
Bushfield	Hatch	Murray
Butler	Hayden	Nye
Byrd	Hill	O'Daniel
Capper	Holman	O'Mahoney
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Clark, Idaho	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Clark, Mo.	Langer	Reed
Connally	Lodge	Revercomb
Danaher	Lucas	Reynolds

Robertson	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Russell	Tunnell	White
Shipstead	Tydings	Wiley
Stewart	Vandenberg	Willis
Taft	Van Nuys	Wilson
Thomas, Idaho	Wallgren	
Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is detained on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate Labor Conditions on the West Coast.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has been confined to a Madison hospital since September 13.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent on official appointments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON PROGRESS OF THE WAR EFFORT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 38), which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,500 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress on the resolution (H. Res. 30) authorizing and directing an investigation of the progress of the war effort.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF THE TARIFF COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, submitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for the Commission for the quarter ending December 31, 1943, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

SUSPENSION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR: PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING—PETITIONS

Mr. GREEN presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of the bills (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, (S. 569) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes, and (S. 682) to prohibit the paid advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio in certain circumstances, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; without amendment (Rept. No. 437).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 932. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 438).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1408. A bill for the relief of the surviving directors of the Chesboard Co., a dissolved Maryland corporation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 1409. A bill for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1410. A bill to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1411. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon claims for damages to private property in the vicinity of Camp Forrest, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 1412. A bill for the relief of Guy Albert Wheaton; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced Senate bill 1413, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILSON introduced S. J. Res. 84, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

PROMOTION OF PERMANENT PEACE—CONSULTATIONS WITH FRIENDLY NATIONS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution for appropriate reference and also request that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 84) requesting the President to invite friendly nations to enter upon consultations with delegates of the United States with a view to the promotion of permanent international peace, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress requests the President of the United States to call upon the nations not engaged in warfare against the United States to enter immediately into deliberations looking toward the promotion of permanent international peace.

There is hereby created to participate in such discussion a committee of six delegates from the United States, two to be appointed by the President, two to be elected by the Senate, and two to be elected by the House of Representatives, which delegates shall take oath as prescribed for public officers.

Upon receipt by the President of notification of the willingness of other nations to enter into such discussions, the committee shall begin consultations with the representatives of such other nations, and shall continue until the delegates are recalled by resolution.

The committee may, or shall, upon written request from the President or from the Congress, or from either branch thereof, report and make recommendations jointly to the President and the Congress.

The President of the United States is requested to do all things necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this resolution.

MAXIMUM PRICES FOR CRUDE PETROLEUM

During the delivery of Mr. HILL's speech, which appears later in today's proceedings, the following occurred:

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, and also to place in the RECORD some statements in support thereof. I send the bill to the desk, and ask that it be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1413) to fix standards for establishing maximum prices for crude petroleum and its products, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That effective as of the date of enactment of this act, in establishing maximum prices for crude petroleum under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the act entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved October 2, 1942, as amended," or under any other provision of law, consideration shall be given to the necessity for finding, developing, and producing additional crude petroleum, and, to parity as indicated by the relationship between the index of crude petroleum and the index of all commodities as reported by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, under the title of "Average Wholesale Prices and Index Numbers," in its wholesale commodity price index, based on the year 1926; provided, however, that such ceilings shall not be fixed or maintained at less than 35 cents per barrel above the present respective price ceilings for crude petroleum of any and all gravities and qualities throughout the United States wherever situate.

Sec. 2. Concurrently with the establishing of maximum crude petroleum prices as provided in section 1 hereof, maximum prices for petroleum products shall be increased sufficiently to compensate for additional prices paid for crude petroleum.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee.

The bill just introduced proposes to fix the standards for establishing prices for crude petroleum and its products. In order that some of the facts upon which the bill is predicated may be set forth, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a few questions and answers with respect to the need for an increase in the price of crude petroleum.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Question No. 1. Why is an increase in the price of crude oil necessary?

Answer. (1) To stimulate exploratory drilling, thereby increasing our oil reserves, thus making more oil available for military, industrial, and civilian needs.

(2) To stimulate secondary recovery.

(3) To prevent the premature abandonment of stripper wells, of which there were 293,000 at the close of 1942 which produced 15 percent, or 203,000,000 barrels, in 1942, and they constitute three-quarters of all producing wells in the United States. Ten thousand five hundred of these wells were abandoned in 1942, resulting in an estimated loss of 44,000,000 barrels of reserves. In 1942 stripper wells employed 52,000 workers with a pay roll of \$93,000,000.

(4) Because the cost of producing crude oil has risen 53 cents per barrel since the price-freeze order became effective (see answer to question 15).

Question No. 2. Why is there a shortage of crude oil?

Answer. (1) It is the result of insufficient price, which has produced the following effects:

(a) Continuous decline in the results of exploratory effort.

(b) Decline in above-ground stocks of crude petroleum.

(c) Decline in total petroleum stocks.

(d) Decline in total well completions.

(e) Increase in percentage of dry holes.

(f) Decline in the productive capacity of the new wells drilled.

(2) The subnormal price has resulted in constantly declining discoveries with less oil found than consumed each year. Not since 1938 have discoveries equalled consumption.

Question No. 3. Is Mr. Pike's statement true that more new fields are being found? Does his statement tell the full story?

Answer. It is true we found more "pools" in 1942 than in any one of the previous 5 years. Mr. Pike failed to reveal the fact that we found less oil, as shown by the following table:

Year	New pools found	Estimated reserves found
1937.....	221	628,742,000
1938.....	256	810,493,000
1939.....	254	340,667,000
1940.....	304	286,338,000
1941.....	341	429,974,000
1942.....	348	260,051,000

Question No. 4. Are we finding as much oil as we are producing?

Answer. No. In the first 6 months of 1943 we found 473,000,000 barrels of new oil. In

the same period we produced 709,000,000 barrels.

Question No. 5. Are oil-producing companies making more money this year than in the last few years? Why?

Answer. Theoretically yes, where profits are computed on oil produced which was found at a low cost in prior years; but actually no, if computed on present-day replacement cost. Published statements for the first half of 1943 of some companies when compared with the same period in 1942, indicate increased earnings; however, when compared with 1941 results are less favorable. The thousands of small producers whose operating statements are not published are not making as much money this year in comparison with the last few years.

Question No. 6. Has the cost of finding oil increased since the price freeze order of October 1, 1941?

Answer. Finding costs have nearly doubled in that period of time and are "roughly four times the indicated per barrel cost of finding oil prior to 1938."

Question No. 7. Have the prices of other raw materials risen more than the price of crude petroleum?

Answer. While prices of raw materials have increased 12½ percent since October 1941 the price of crude oil (a raw material) after giving effect to the minor price ceiling adjustments, made by O. P. A., has increased only slightly more than 1½ percent.

Question No. 8. What would be the effect of a 35-cent per barrel increase in the price of crude oil on the cost of living?

Answer. Fifty-eight one-thousandths of 1 percent, raising the index on cost of living from 124.8 to 124.846, an increase so insignificant that it would not cause any change in the United States Bureau of Labor statistics published index figure.

Question No. 9. Can we increase our production of crude petroleum?

Answer. With the exception of west Texas and New Mexico, we are now producing oil in excess of good conservation practices. Until the rate of drilling new wells is substantially increased, production of crude oil will decline. By the time transportation is made available to move additional west Texas and New Mexico crude the decline in domestic crude production may offset any increase from these areas.

Question No. 10. Are we drilling as many wildcat wells as we did in 1941?

Answer. No. The average number of wildcat wells drilled per month is as follows:

1941.....	272
1942.....	263
1943.....	262

Question No. 11. What is the crude-oil price index according to Labor Department statistics using 1926 as a base, and how does it compare with all-commodity price index on the same basis for 1943?

Answer. Crude oil, 62.2; all commodities, 102.8. To bring the national average price of crude up to an index of 102.8, the price per barrel should be \$1.93, which would require an increase of 76 cents per barrel over the present national average price of \$1.17 per barrel.

Question No. 12. Have our labor costs increased since the price-freeze order?

Answer. Our labor costs have increased 31 percent, based on Bureau of Labor Statistics average weekly earnings for crude-petroleum production.

Question No. 13. Is the statement correct that the output of oil has increased 66 percent since the beginning of hostilities? What are the facts?

Answer. No. Using September 1, 1939, as the date of the outbreak of hostilities in Europe, average daily production of crude petroleum for September 1, 1939, based on total productions for that month per Bureau

of Mines, was 3,608,000 barrels. Indicated daily average production for August 1943 was 4,217,000 barrels—an increase of between 16 and 17 percent.

Question No. 14. How much has production increased since the announcement of the price freeze on crude petroleum?

Answer. For the 19 months since the O. P. A. price freeze was imposed on crude oil, the total production in this country was only 1½ percent more than for the 19-month period prior to the price freeze on crude.

Question No. 15. Is the Tariff Commission's report on cost of producing crude petroleum for the years 1939 and 1940, and the 9 months ending September 30, 1941, a proper basis upon which to maintain the price freeze placed on crude petroleum by the O. P. A.?

Answer. No. That report includes the production data of only 13 percent of the oil producers in this country, who owned only one-half of the wells producing crude petroleum. It does not provide for the recovery of capital invested in the drilling of wells prior to 1931. It failed to include an adequate amount for dry holes. It made no allowance for interest on borrowed money. The calculations of production costs as shown in that report did not include the cost of exploring for, discovering, and developing new reserves of crude oil to replace the oil currently produced. Sales at present ceiling prices of crude oil which was found and developed in previous years at low cost, result in a profit, but the cost of finding and developing new oil to replace the oil currently produced, is greater than the present ceiling prices. Production of new oil found is at a loss. This condition encourages liquidation of oil reserves; it discourages exploratory effort and the development of new reserves, resulting in a failure to maintain and make available adequate supplies of crude petroleum for future essential requirements.

Question No. 16. What is the relation of net additional oil wells put into operation to the average price of crude oil?

Answer. In 1916 we put approximately 10,000 additional wells into operation. The prevailing price was \$1.10. In 1920, when the average price of crude petroleum rose to \$3.07, we drilled and put into operation 40,163 producing oil wells. In 1931, when the price of oil dropped to 65 cents per barrel, there was a reduction of 15,220 in the total number of operating oil wells.

Question No. 17. What are the percentage war demands for gasoline?

Answer. Based on data available for P. A. W. districts I, II, and III, the increasing percentage of total gasoline that goes to the military are:

	Percent
In 1942.....	12.5
First quarter, 1943.....	21.4
Second quarter, 1943.....	23.1
Last half, 1943 (estimated).....	20.6
In 1944 (estimated).....	37.6
In 1945 (estimated).....	39.6

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement with respect to the cost of production of crude petroleum.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Subcommittee on Cost of Production has been meeting for the past 2 days for the purpose of determining the cost of finding, developing, and producing crude oil as of June 30, 1943. Also, to consider the effect that the 48-hour week will have on future costs and to determine the increased costs since October 1941, which was the date of freezing the price of crude oil.

The Tariff Commission report on cost of Producing Crude Petroleum for the years

1939-40, and the 9 months ended September 30, 1941, is not a proper basis upon which to maintain the price freeze placed on crude petroleum by the Office of Price Administration.

It is historical and does not provide for replacement costs.

It does not include any provision for the cost of financing exploratory and development work. Interest on borrowed funds is a substantial amount.

It does not include any allowance for the thousands of operators whose individual production is small, and whose average production costs are substantially higher than the production costs of the few major companies and other large companies whose volume of production enables them to produce crude petroleum at a lower cost than the average producer and whose figures dominate the results shown by the Tariff Commission.

The finding and developing costs are based on the cost of the finding of discoveries and extensions of pools for the first 6 months of the year amounting to 437,963,000 barrels of oil. The operating costs are based on the cost of producing 709,342,000 barrels. It is estimated that the extensions and discoveries are 272,000,000 short of equalling the production for the first 6 months of the year. We realize that it would very likely cost more to find and discover the additional 272,000,000 barrels necessary to maintain reserves than it did to find and discover the 437,963,000 barrels, but no allowance has been made for this point.

We have estimated that the cost of finding, producing, and developing a barrel of crude oil as of June 30, 1943, was \$1.244 which is an increase of 48 cents per barrel over the cost of the third quarter of 1941, as reflected by the Tariff Commission's report. We further estimate that the 48-hour week will increase the cost at least 5 cents per barrel. This would bring the cost at the present date to \$1.294, exclusive of interest for capital.

The costs are summarized below:

Finding costs.....	\$0.578
Development costs.....	.320
Production costs.....	.388
	1.286
Less gas and miscellaneous revenue..	.042
	1.244
Estimated June 30, 1943, cost.....	1.244
Estimated additional costs caused by increased hours at overtime rate..	.050
	1.294
Tariff Commission report, third quarter 1941, cost.....	.764
Increased cost since the freezing of crude oil prices.....	.53

The margin above cost should be sufficient to provide for:

- Funds for the exploration needed to find adequate new reserves.
- Funds to cover replacement cost.
- A reserve fund for secondary recovery or other conservation measures.
- A fair return on borrowed and invested capital, taking into consideration the extreme hazards involved in searching for and finding oil.
- To maintain the industry as a healthy, going concern.
- For Federal and State income taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). The bill will be referred to the committee—

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma asked that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee. I do not happen to know what the appropriate committee is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was about to announce that the bill will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HATCH. Before the bill is referred I wish to make a request, perhaps of the Chair, and also of the Senator from Oklahoma. There was appointed by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys a subcommittee, headed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. That subcommittee made quite an extensive study of this entire subject. I wonder if the bill might be referred to that committee, to be studied by the subcommittee of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am entirely willing that the bill go to any committee to which the Chair may see fit to refer it. The question of what committee the bill shall be referred to is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Chair.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the bill deals with price ceilings which have been effected under the Price Control Act, and it seems to me the bill should go to the committee which dealt with that subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I wish Senators would turn this way when they speak. I could not follow anything that was said by the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Kentucky, or the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator that the discussion has related only to the committee to which the bill should be referred. The Chair was about to announce that it would be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, which had sponsored the price-control legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is by reason of the fact that it proposes to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, which was considered originally by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3291) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF SLUM CLEARANCE AND HOUSING PROGRAM IN THE DISTRICT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 184), which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia investigate the slum clearance and housing program now being administered or proposed by the National Capital Housing Authority, with a view to recommending a sound program for meeting the needs of the National Capital for the same, both during the present emergency and in the post-war period, and for financing the program.

AMERICAN LEGION STAND ON SIZE OF ARMY

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I read a telegram from Francis M. Sullivan, executive director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, dated September 28, addressed to me:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 28, 1943.
HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Legion, at its national convention held at Omaha last week, adopted a resolution with respect to manpower army reading as follows:

"The Chief of Staff has stated that 7,700,000 men are needed by December 31, 1943. As this figure has been based upon a definite strategic plan and worked out by the experts, any authority who undertakes to change this figure, recommended as a minimum for the plan envisaged, must assume the responsibility for the effect upon the plan which may result from such change."

I feel certain Senate would want Legion viewpoint on this vital subject.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
Executive Director, National Legislative Committee of the American Legion.

NUMBER OF ENLISTED MEN IN THE ARMY IN THE UNITED STATES ON SEPTEMBER 1, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me a letter from the War Department dated October 2, 1943, signed by Brig. Gen. Edward W. Smith, Deputy Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division. The letter is addressed to me as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, and reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, October 2, 1943.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: There is herewith submitted for the record of the proceedings of S. 763 the following information, which was requested for the record:

The Army has in the United States (as of September 1, 1943) 1,172,000 enlisted men with 1 to 2 years service, 510,000 enlisted men with 2 to 3 years service, 84,000 enlisted men with over 3 years service.

NOTE.—Figures are based on carefully controlled sample survey.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD W. SMITH,
Brigadier General, G. S. C., Deputy
Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division.

DISCHARGES OF LIMITED-SERVICE MEN AT CAMP CLAIBORNE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me a memorandum from the War Department signed by Maj. Bryce N. Harlow, General Staff Corps, on the subject Information Requested of the Chief of Staff. The communication reads:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, September 29, 1943.

1. On Monday, September 20, 1943, Senator BURTON K. WHEELER asked General Marshall to justify an alleged discharge of 5,000 limited-service men from Camp Claiborne during the previous 30 days.

2. Between August 15 and September 15, 1943, 1,127 discharges took place at Camp Claiborne. These discharges were for all

causes, not for limited-service personnel exclusively. During this period, Camp Claiborne was used as a reclassification and discharge center—for the stations of the Eighth Service Command, the Army Air Forces, and the Army Ground Forces units in the Louisiana maneuver area. Individuals who could not be absorbed in their units were transferred to Camp Claiborne for screening and reassignment. No man was discharged merely because he was "limited service." On the contrary, men whom the Army could utilize in station complements or service units were transferred thereto.

For the Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division:

BRYCE N. HARLOW,
Major, General Staff Corps,
Assistant Executive.

RICHARD L. RIEDEL

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, for more than 25 years Richard L. Riedel, a young employee of the United States Senate, has served as contact man between Senators and the representatives of the press, the various photographic units, and the radio representatives assigned to this branch of the National Government. Richard is known to every Member of the Senate. He is a young man of only 34 years of age; nevertheless, he has been in the service of the Government, engaged in the Senate, for more than 25 years, having begun his service during the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

I am sure that every Member of the Senate deeply appreciates the excellent and courteous service Richard has rendered the Members of this body from time to time. Being one of the Members of the Senate who appreciates very deeply his courteous attention and service in bringing us in contact from day to day and time to time with members of the press, the radio, and the photographers, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the Record of today a very interesting, truthful, and excellent article in regard to Richard L. Riedel. The article appeared in the Evening Star of Tuesday, September 28, 1943, and is entitled "R. L. Riedel, Liaison Man at 34, Marks Twenty-fifth Year on Senate Job."

During my service in the Senate I have never found any employee of the Senate more courteous, affable, or agreeable than is Mr. Riedel.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

R. L. RIEDEL, LIAISON MAN AT 34, MARKS TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR ON SENATE JOB

Richard Langham Riedel is only 34, but he began today his twenty-sixth year as an employee of the Senate.

Mr. Riedel, starting his long service as a page, now is chief liaison man between the Senators and the press, radio, and photographers. For years he has been a familiar figure to correspondents in the Senate Gallery who sought emergency interviews with Senators, and usually it was he who called them off the floor to meet reporters in an anteroom.

When Mr. Riedel began work at the Senate September 27, 1918, Woodrow Wilson was President; Thomas R. Marshall, Vice President; and Champ Clark, Speaker. The last Union veteran in the Senate, Francis E.

Warren, of Wyoming, father-in-law of General Pershing, still was in office, and so was the last Confederate veteran, John H. Bankhead, Sr., of Alabama, father of the late Speaker, William B. Bankhead, and of the present Senator, John H. Bankhead. Five of the first Senators from newly admitted States were sitting.

Only three men who then were in the Senate and have served consecutively since remain in the Chamber. They are Senators SMITH, Democrat, of South Carolina; McKELLAR, Democrat, of Tennessee; and JOHNSON, Republican, of California. Minority Leader McNARY had been in the Senate, but was out from November 6 to December 18, 1918, awaiting the start of a new term. Senator GERRY, Democrat, of Rhode Island, was a Member when the youth signed up, but later his tenure of office was interrupted for several years.

Mr. Riedel is a ready reference on all the present Senators, their affiliations, and backgrounds. He also knows every newspaperman, radio commentator, and photographer who visits the Senate regularly and many who appear occasionally. In the early days of talking pictures he helped persuade some doubting Senators that it was safe for them to speak into the new camera.

He plans to celebrate his silver anniversary under the Capitol dome by giving a series of lectures on Washington illustrated with motion pictures and slides he made. The lectures, he said, deal with the city, its people, its endless pageantry, and its scenic and historic surroundings.

PLOTTING A SENSIBLE COURSE FOR PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address, entitled "Plotting a Sensible Course for Peace," delivered by him in Denver on September 15, 1943, before the Social Service Foundation of the University of Denver in cooperation with the Rocky Mountain Radio Council, which appears in the Appendix.]

VISIT BY SENATORS TO FIGHTING FRONTS

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock from the New York Times of October 3, 1943, entitled "War Tour by Senators Promises Wide Benefits," and an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of October 4, 1943, entitled "Men Who Justify the Existence of America," relating to the recent tour of battle fronts by Senators, with particular reference to the report made on the floor of the Senate by Senator LONG, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEAK UP AMERICA—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Speak Up America," delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon, October 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

AVAILABLE ACREAGE FOR PRODUCTION—ADDRESS BY CARL H. WILKEN

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Available Acreage for Production," delivered by Carl H. Wilken, educational director, National Association of Agricultural Commissioners and Secretaries, at the recent National Food Conference at Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS—LETTER FROM JAMES S. KNOWLSON

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to Mayor Kelly, of Chicago, by James S.

Knowlson, chairman, Post-War Economic Advisory Council of Chicago, dealing with the subject of termination of war contracts, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE—REVIEW BY DAVID G. FARRELLY

[Mr. VAN NUYS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review of the Senate Judiciary Committee by David G. Farrelly, of Princeton University, published in the June issue of the American Political Science Review, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE YOUNG DEAD SOLDIERS DO NOT SPEAK—EDITORIAL BY ARCHIBALD MACLEISH

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Young Dead Soldiers Do Not Speak," written by Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, and published in connection with the recent War bond drive, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On September 30, 1943:

S. 929. An act for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson.

On October 1, 1943:

S. 332. An act for the relief of Velma Pikkarainen.

AMERICA'S CLOSED-DOOR POLICY

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "End America's Closed-Door Policy Now," which appeared in the September 20 issue of Christianity and Crisis. The article comments upon an interview with Bishop Paul Yu-Pin, distinguished Chinese churchman, which earlier appeared in the Commonweal.

I am among those who have long felt the need for a change in the law which completely excludes Chinese immigration into the United States, and I am impressed by this article, and by the statement of Bishop Yu-Pin, who treats the subject very frankly.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END AMERICA'S CLOSED-DOOR POLICY NOW

Our esteemed contemporary The Commonweal carried a deeply moving interview with Bishop Paul Yu-pin, visiting Roman Catholic leader. He permitted himself a certain frankness which even Madame Chiang avoided in her public utterances. Yet he spoke a word which America needs to hear from the lips of a representative Chinese. He will be charged by some with having sought to intimidate America. But only fools will avoid a certain tremor of apprehension at the obvious truth of what the bishop had to say regarding America's closed-door policy by which Chinese are excluded from the immigration quota and from the privilege of citizenship, a long-time policy

conceived in prejudice and ill will in 1882 and recently again confirmed by congressional committee action.

Here are his words as quoted in The Commonwealth interview: "If your attitude of superiority continues, if the Far East becomes convinced that the United States has forfeited her moral right to leadership and is fixed in her determination to look down upon the colored races, I can foresee only a prospect which makes me tremble at its horrors."

* * * In that case the next war would almost inevitably be a war between races, and that would mean a war in which not only armies are pitted against each other, armies and industries, but a war in which child is against child, woman against woman, grandfather against grandfather. * * * It would literally be to the death, and we would not hear of unconditional surrender, but of annihilation.

"Here the legislature of the greatest of the United Nations, the one to which China looked for true understanding, reaffirms a racist law of the most insulting and stringent kind. * * * It comes as a deadly blow to all we had hoped for. * * * No matter how friendly any of us may personally be towards you, we cannot answer for the thoughts of our countrymen's hearts. They will think that the Atlantic Charter is a sham. They will think that your adherence to Christianity is a hypocrisy."

If the common answer be given—"Would you have us open our gates to a flood of Chinese immigration?" (actually it would mean less than 150 a year on the present quota plan)—Bishop Yu-pin has this to say: "We do not wish to have you open your country to a flood of Chinese immigrants. That is your own problem, for you to solve precisely as you wish. It is an internal problem. But we do object to being branded not only as being inferior to you, but as inferior to all the other nations and races in the world, without exception. And this is precisely what your Chinese Exclusion Act does. This is what it means to the Chinese, and no other meaning can logically be attached to it."

These are strong words, but they are not too strong. They are utterly candid and utterly true as anyone knows who has lived in China. They give weight to the fears recently expressed by Pearl Buck and others.

What will American Christianity do? To our sorrow we recall that when the country was madly selling military supplies to the Japanese—whose enmity we had recklessly purchased in part with a crude and unnecessary exclusion act—the church forces were unable to persuade Congress of the suicidal nature of our policy. Events have shown that the churches were right.

Will there be another failure, and a still more inexcusable one? The answer is that there may be unless extraordinary efforts are now made to get a review of the matter in Congress at some early future date.

It is plain to see that careful but plain-spoken education is needed. It ought to be possible not only to enlist the support of the many friends of China throughout the land but likewise of the parents of the boys who have laid down their lives—or may be called upon to lay down their lives—fighting in the Pacific. It ought to be possible to secure the active support of those whose sons, now infants, may be involved in World War No. 3, if such folly is not redeemed by action consistent with our loudly announced principles.

Happily the abolition of extraterritoriality has been achieved, although it took 20 years for others to follow the example of Russia in this action, and one can recall the time when to suggest it was to have verbal brickbats hurled at one's head. The effect of this throughout China was electric. It brought forth the expression of an almost pathetic

gratitude. It is safe to assume that had there been no war this victory would have been very hard, if not impossible, to win. The time for action on the Exclusion Act is now, while the thought of America is concerned with China and China's heroic part in our war effort.

If this strikes you as sound, why not do something about it? The place to begin is in your own community, your church, your political circle. Mme. Chiang has reminded us that "the Lord helps those who help themselves." If we accomplish the righting of this wrong we shall not only be helping China; we shall most emphatically be helping ourselves and building a bulwark against the racial conflict which is otherwise only too possible.

It might be well to remember that of the world's population less than a third are white.
H. S. L.

Mr. MALONEY. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there may also be printed at this point in the RECORD, an article by Gould Lincoln, which appeared in Saturday's Washington Star, and which deals with the same subject, and clearly explains why we should take immediate action on a measure proposed by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS]. The Senator from Florida has heretofore addressed the Senate on the subject and has introduced a bill which would do justice to our great ally.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL (By Gould Lincoln)

A real effort to get Congress to repeal the laws excluding Chinese immigration into the United States and to place China on an immigration quota, along with other nations, is under way. Senator ANDREWS, Democrat, of Florida, has introduced a bill for this purpose—a companion to the bill which was introduced in the House last June by Representative MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington.

The advisability, as well as the justice, of such a move is apparent. China is our ally. She has waged for years a magnificent defensive war against the Japanese, our enemy. The resentment of the Chinese against American exclusion laws is well understood. A repeal of these laws would have a psychological effect of great value, not only during the war, but also in the post-war period, when China will be due for a great revival of industry and trade.

Sixty years ago this country enacted its first Chinese Exclusion Act. At that time employers of labor, particularly the railroad builders, had been importing Chinese coolies in unrestricted numbers. Because they were willing to work long hours for little pay and were able to live on far less than American labor was willing or able to live on, there was a roar against the importation of Chinese labor. In 1882, therefore, the Congress put through the Exclusion Act.

JAP EXCLUSION SOUGHT

Not long after this, there also was a demand for the exclusion of Japanese labor. President Theodore Roosevelt, in 1907, was able to negotiate the so-called gentleman's agreement with Japan, whereby Japanese immigration was limited without the enactment of a law. In 1924, however, Congress prohibited Japanese immigration. Only doctors, ministers, and students were admitted thereafter.

Under the present immigration quota law, the Chinese would be allowed only 105 immigrants into this country per year. The small number, even if the Chinese were able and willing to work for less wages and to live on less food, could not be considered a threat either to American labor or to American standards of living. This maximum immigration from all countries permitted under the quota law, based on the size of the blood strains already in the United States, is 153,774 persons annually.

Senator ANDREWS already has interested Chairman RUSSELL of the Senate Immigration Committee in his bill. Senator ANDREWS is himself a member of the committee. It is his hope that it will be possible to begin hearings on the measure in the near future. The State and Justice Departments have been requested to make reports on the bill. When these have been received, Senator ANDREWS plans to ask the committee to begin immediate consideration of the proposal.

CHINESE PRAISED

When he offered his bill Senator ANDREWS said: "The heroic accomplishments of the Chinese people as one of the United Nations in the present global war against totalitarianism make it very appropriate that China should be treated on a par with other countries. The United States has already entered on this policy by voluntarily relinquishing extraterritorial jurisdiction over Americans in China and abolishing the United States Court in China, which for years exercised jurisdiction over such cases. I dedicate my efforts in this matter personally to the First Lady of China, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, and her heroic husband, recently made President of China, in an effort to aid in a continued friendship which I trust will be everlasting."

In the new world which is expected to arise from the ashes of the present war, China, with her 450,000,000 people, is expected to play an important part. Her leaders are intent upon China's becoming a great, educated, industrial nation as well as agricultural. The estimates of her needs are fabulous in materials of all kinds. It is high time, in the opinion of Senator ANDREWS, that the friendship between this country and China be cemented. Nothing, in his opinion, could be done which would tend to tighten this friendship more than a repeal of the Exclusion Act.

WARREN BACKS MOVE

It is worthy of note that the bill has been offered in the House by a Member from the Pacific coast, where the demand for Chinese, as well as Japanese, exclusion first held sway. Representative MAGNUSON feels as strongly in this matter of improving relations with China as does Senator ANDREWS. Recently when Governor Warren, of California, was attending the meeting of the Republican Post-War Advisory Council on Mackinac Island, Mich., he was asked about the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act and permit Chinese immigration under the quota system. Governor Warren said then that if the move could be confined to the Chinese, he saw no reason it should not be carried forward. He expressed a fear that later an effort might be made to broaden it, even to the inclusion of Japanese. That, he said, the people of California would firmly resist.

The present strategy is to get Senate approval of the bill first and then bring it up in the House committee and in the House itself. The supporters of the measure are looking forward with interest to the attitude of the administration on the measure. This it is expected will be expressed in the letters which the Senate committee expects to receive from the State and Justice Departments. The immigration bureau is now

in the Justice Department, having been transferred from the Labor Department.

**SUNFLOWER ORDINANCE PROJECT,
DE SOTO, KANS.**

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "The Sunflower Scandal," published in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUNFLOWER SCANDAL

The war's most sensational graft charges, involving construction contractors on the Sunflower ordinance project at De Soto, Kans., were made by Senator LANGER in the United States Senate this week on the basis of information submitted by former Gov. Payne Ratner, of Kansas.

The ordinance plant, which has never produced any powder, was originally scheduled to cost \$56,000,000, but LANGER claims it has already cost \$129,000,000, and construction is still going on.

Thousands of feet of new lumber, it is charged, were burnt as waste, while temporary buildings, made of good used lumber, were simply knocked down by bulldozers and swept aside. Millions of pounds of concrete were defectively mixed, with the result that piers, columns, and foundations cracked and fell in. It is claimed that excessive amounts of water were mixed with the concrete in order to increase the use of cement, and it is alleged that foremen were actually given bonuses according to the amount of material they could waste.

Langer stated that three C. C. C.-type buildings were hauled down from Iowa at a labor cost of \$55,000 when they could have been reproduced in brick for \$15,000, that one contractor bought 1,000,000 pencils at 9 cents each when they can be purchased retail for two for a nickel, and that unused structural steel, kegs of bolts, lengths of pipe, etc., were actually buried in the ground for purposes of concealment. Cases are cited where hundreds of workmen "hid out" at wages as high as 90 cents an hour, because material on sidings never reached the jobs, and where dirt was hauled 1 yard at a time in 5-yard trucks at the regular 5-yard price, running the dirt-moving cost up to \$5,000,000, when it should have been \$625,000.

The cost of the Sunflower works, whether it produces a pound of powder or not, will equal the entire cost of the War of 1812.

What is disturbing is Senator LANGER's charge that these allegations as they have developed have been placed before the Department of Justice and that agents from the Attorney General's office, sent to the Sunflower project, have stated that they have found no irregularities, and the Attorney General has therefore refused to begin any prosecutions. Senator LANGER further states that when former Governor Ratner sought information from Federal agencies as to the identity of the stockholders and directors of the various contracting corporations the information was refused on the ground that it was confidential matter.

It is difficult for the average citizen to believe that under all this smoke there is not at least some fire. There is no graft so easy to conceal as war graft, for all kinds of dirt can be swept under the rug of military secrecy. But any scandal of the magnitude charged in the Sunflower case deserves special congressional investigation with a full and open hearing on all pertinent facts.

In a nation which has set the school children to gathering up bits of scrap metal, which refuses farmers the lumber to build barns, and which pleads for every possible dollar to be placed in War bonds, any claim by responsible persons that good metal is being buried, good lumber burned, and good money thrown away to no purpose is a matter of national concern.

SHORTAGE OF CARS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF CROPS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate again, as I have time and again since the Congress reconvened, the situation in the Northwest relative to the boxcars furnished by the railroads to carry the crops. Senators are familiar with the fact that a hundred or more telegrams have been published in the RECORD which have been sent here by various elevators and leading farm organizations. This morning I received a telegram from the North Dakota Public Service Commission, by Ben C. Larkin and C. W. McDonnell, also carrying the signature of the commissioner of agriculture and labor, by Matt Dahl, as well as the attorney general, State of North Dakota, by Neal E. Williams, special assistant. The situation in North Dakota is appalling. The telegram is as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., October 1, 1943.
UNITED STATES SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building:

Shippers advisory board meeting yesterday develops that American railroads will be required to furnish approximately 10,000 grain cars per month to Canadian railroads at Portal, N. Dak., Emerson, Manitoba, and Duluth, Minn., to transport approximately 18,000,000 bushels feed wheat to United States for consumption in southeast and eastern territory. Understand this is under order Department of Agriculture and War Food Administration. North Dakota farmers, grain elevators, producers, and others object strenuously to the arrangement while North Dakota's wheat, flax, and other grains are being dumped on the ground for lack of railroad cars. We have over 1,100 elevators blocked at this time. Some have been blocked since last June. If we don't get cars immediately to handle this grain our farmers will lose millions of bushels through deterioration and this valuable food crop so important to the war effort will go to waste. Snow will begin to cover our crops which are only 60 percent harvested at this time unless you intervene to save the situation. Too much attention being devoted to obsolete car service rule while our crops are spoiling on the ground for lack of boxcars and our War Food Administration paying attention to Canadian feed for southeast and eastern farmers while food spoils in North Dakota. Flax is being wind-rowed account no place to store under cover at this time. Can you personally take charge of this situation until North Dakota elevators are opened up for business? Understand that cars intended for North Dakota being diverted to other territories before reaching North Dakota.

Mr. President, I took the matter up with the proper authorities in Washington and was told that nothing could be done about the matter. Mind you, the railroads are saying they cannot obtain cars. Yet we find this item in the Washington Evening Star of October 1, 1943. The headline is as follows:

Sixty new boxcars are offered for sale in newspaper ads.

The article continues:

Railroad facilities are burdened to capacity with wartime freight loads, but 60 nearly new boxcars were advertised for sale here today—to anyone with the purchase price and an engine to haul them away.

To make the offer more attractive, the owner, the Warren Tank Car Co., of Warren, Pa., promised to paint the cars without extra charge and to letter on the name or numerals of the purchaser.

Melvin D. Hildreth, attorney at 1420 New York Avenue NW., who inserted newspaper ads for the tank-car company, said he was certain someone would be interested in view of the difficulty of obtaining railroad rolling stock today.

Mr. Hildreth said, however, that he had failed in attempts to dispose of the cars to Government agencies interested in the transportation problem.

In other words, Mr. President, while our grain is spoiling in North Dakota the transportation agencies of the country are refusing to buy these 60 boxcars which could be used to transport our crops.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator from North Dakota to place something in the RECORD. If he is going to make a speech I shall have to decline to yield further, because I must proceed with my speech. With all courtesy to my good friend, I shall yield for him to place something in the RECORD, but must decline to yield for a speech.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Alabama. I serve notice that later this afternoon, at the first opportunity, I shall submit a resolution and ask for unanimous action on it, so we may help the food situation and the farmers of North Dakota.

FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator to yield to me for about 7 minutes, in which time I wish to place in the RECORD some facts and figures dealing with the Federal civilian employees in the State of California. I do not think it will take more than 5 or 6, or at the outside 7 minutes to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Illinois for that purpose?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I declined to yield further to my friend the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. Is the Senator from Illinois going to make much comment?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I am simply going to read certain figures into the RECORD, and then make very brief comment concerning them. If I take what the Senator considers to be too much time, he can do with me as he did with the Senator from North Dakota, refuse to yield further.

Mr. HILL. Very well, Mr. President, I yield for the purpose indicated by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, when on September 14 we returned from a 2-months' recess, my very able and loquacious friend, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], made a lengthy speech in which he discussed primarily what he had discovered during that time among his own people in Wisconsin. He distinctly said that among all persons on the home front there was "grave concern about the vast bureaucracy of Federal employees."

Then he proceeded to talk about his own State. He also laid particular stress upon conditions in the State of California, saying that in that State there were 232,500 employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government. When I asked the able junior Senator from Wisconsin if he had a break-down of that figure, he said he did not, but that he would obtain one in order to give the country the true information with respect to the employees.

I have watched the RECORD daily, to ascertain the information which I assumed would be forthcoming through the efforts of the Senator from Wisconsin; but to date it has not been presented to the Senate. Therefore, I took it upon myself to find out, through the Civil Service Commission, who were included in the figure 232,000 Federal employees in the State of California; because the statement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin intrigued me to the point where I wanted to know the classification by categories of the employees. In that debate I specifically asked the Senator whether the figure he cited did not include Army and Navy employees. His reply was that he did not think so, but he did not know.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from the Civil Service Commission. The Commission has gone into the problem, which, as it affects California, affects every other State in the Union. The letter in substance is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: In reply to your letter of September 25, 1943, concerning Federal employment in the State of California, the following data are submitted:

Total Federal civilian employees in California—234,400.

Mr. President, when one reads the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin; which does not give any break-down whatever, one is led to the conclusion that men working in the Army or the Navy are in the group mentioned by the Senator, and that all of them are Federal employees who for some cause or other, some mysterious reason, have been played upon the pay roll; just as someone in my State—I think it was the attorney general—recently had the temerity to say in a speech that the Federal Government was moving 200,000 Federal employees into the State in order to control the election in 1944.

Here is the break-down:

War Department, 112,400.

Navy Department, 72,900.

O. P. A., 3,900.

Office for Emergency Management, 5,800.

The Office for Emergency Management includes the Office of Alien Property Custodian,

the central administrative agencies, the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the National War Labor Board, the Office of Civilian Defense, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Office of Economic Stabilization, the Office of Lend-Lease Administration, the Office of Liaison Officer, the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the Office of War Information, the War Manpower Commission, the War Production Board, the War Relocation Authority, and the War Shipping Administration. In all those agencies, in California, there are 5,800 employees.

In other war agencies in California there are 3,200 employees; and those agencies include the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, the Maritime Commission, the Board of Economic Warfare, and the Office of Censorship.

In the Treasury Department there are 4,300 employees in the State of California. In the Post Office Department, 17,400 employees in California. In the Department of Agriculture, 4,600; in the Department of Commerce, 1,200; in the National Housing Agency, 1,600; in the Federal Works Agency, 500; in the Civil Service Commission, 300; in the Veterans Administration, 2,700; in all other agencies, 3,600.

Mr. President, in that tabulation there are many of the long-established agencies, and I dare say that no one is very anxious to take employees away from a number of those agencies which have been in existence for many years. The other of the agencies grew out of the war. The figures I have cited are taken, so the Civil Service Commission says—from a recent survey by the Civil Service Commission covering employment during the period April 1–June 30, 1943. These employment statistics include only civilian employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

The letter to me from the Civil Service Commission concludes as follows:

The total for the War Department includes all civilian employees in army air depots and bases, signal and medical depots, ordnance depots, hospitals, camps, posts, and stations; the total for the Navy Department includes all civilian personnel engaged in navy yards, supply depots, air stations, hospital and other Naval establishments. It might be mentioned that the bulk of these War and Navy civilian employees are manual workers such as mechanics and other skilled artisans, semiskilled operatives, laborers, and helpers.

Yours respectfully,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President, Civil Service Commission.

So much has been said by the opposition about the bungling bureaucrats, so much will be said in the future, that it is apparent to anyone who reads between the lines, or who even reads the lines themselves, that bureaucracy in Government is the chief thing the opposition will rely upon in the future. When they come forth on the floor of the Senate with a statement of the kind I have mentioned, denouncing bureaucracy in Government in no uncertain terms, but leaving the Senate and the public at large to guess what the figures mean, I say it is totally unfair to the American people. For that reason, I went into the figures

submitted by the junior Senator from Wisconsin on California alone in order that the Senate and the country might know what the break-down is.

I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding this time to me.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has referred to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Ordinarily, I should be inclined to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin; but I have now yielded 40 minutes. Let me ask whether the Senator desires to make a request to have matter printed in the RECORD, or whether he desires to make a speech.

Mr. WILEY. No, Mr. President; I do not have in mind requesting the insertion of matter in the RECORD. I think the practice of the Senate has been that when one Senator questions another Senator, the Senator who is questioned is given an opportunity to reply.

I assure the Senator from Alabama that if he will give me 5 or 6 minutes, it will not take more than that to reply to what was said by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois. I shall not even debate with my friend from Illinois the question of who is the more loquacious, he or I. That issue is irrelevant.

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator for a few minutes; but I must say to him very frankly that unless he makes his remarks very short and very brief, I cannot yield further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I listened with a great deal of interest to my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Illinois. At one time I thought he was going to say something of great significance. His speech was really a defense of bureaucracy. If he will read the remarks which I made on the 14th of September, he will see that I said on that occasion that I had just been handed the data, and that I would check into them and obtain a break-down, if possible. I did attempt to check into them and get a break-down. The undisputed figures show that there are engaged in the Government service at this time more than 3,000,000 men and women. It is true that 40 percent of them are engaged in the war-production plants, but the other 1,600,000 are out-and-out bureaucrats.

That is the way our friends the new dealers have reduced the number of Government employees. If we go back to 1932, we remember that one of the pledges made to the Nation was that bureaucracy would be reduced. At that time the Federal Government employed approximately 562,000 people in the civil service. Now the number is in excess of 3,000,000. At the time Roosevelt took over in March 1933 there were about 65,000 Government employees in Washington. Now there are in Washington over 300,000 Government employees. The distinguished Senator from Illinois brought out the fact that there were 120,400 persons engaged in the War De-

partment services in California and 72,900 engaged in the Navy. That would leave approximately 30,000 Federal employees still in the other bureaus—in one State alone.

For days now we have been talking about manpower. Think of it! In one State in this country, according to these figures, 203,300 persons have been taken out of active Navy and Army service. I asked the Bureau to break down these figures further for me. I said that I wanted to know what those employees were doing, and whether or not men were engaged in sweeping floors when they ought to be in the Army and Navy. So far, however, we have obtained no breakdown. I do not question the ability and integrity of many of those Government servants. I do question the necessity in wartime of employing so many of them, especially when the armed services are calling for men.

I might say—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I shall have to decline to yield further.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to report that the Committee on the Judiciary—

Mr. HILL. I decline to yield. If the Senator wishes me to yield to him for the purpose of submitting some report, he must ask that I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The Chair rules that the Senator from Alabama has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that when the Senator from Alabama yielded to me, the floor became mine. I ask for a ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin conditionally, and stated at the time that the Senator would have to conclude promptly; otherwise he would have to decline to yield further.

Mr. WILEY. I make the point of order that the rules do not provide for conditional yielding. I ask for a ruling on that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the precedents the point of order of the Senator from Wisconsin is overruled. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate presents to the Senate a momentous decision the like of which, so far as I can ascertain, the Congress was never called upon to make during the last great war. Certainly this is the first time it has been called upon to make so momentous a decision during this war.

The decision which the Congress must make is whether or not the Congress shall interfere with the plans and the grand strategy of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the high command of the Army and Navy; whether or not the Congress shall set up its judgment and attempt to say to the high command and the Joint Chiefs of Staff that their plans must be changed, that the Congress imposes its judgment and says to them that they may not carry out their plans as they have made them, but that they must do what Congress says and change their plans.

The bill would have Congress not take affirmative action, not do something which would help or fortify or strengthen the war effort; but would have Congress negative that which it has already done in behalf of the war effort. The bill would have Congress change the policy which it declared in the Selective Service Act. The bill would do violence to that act. It would strike at the fundamental theory and basis of the act.

When Congress enacted the Selective Service Act, it refused to make any class distinctions. It refused to legislate upon any class basis. Congress envisioned the Selective Service Act as Woodrow Wilson had envisioned it during the last war, when he declared that it was an act not for the conscription of the individual, but for selection from a nation which had volunteered en masse. In enacting that legislation Congress decided that it would select men between the ages of 18 and 38; that those who could render the greatest and best service in the armed forces would stay in the armed forces; and that those who could render greater or better service in some other occupation than the armed services would serve in other places.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think perhaps the Senator would like to correct a statement which he made. He stated that Congress had decided that we should select men between the ages of 18 and 33. So far as I know, Congress has never mentioned the age 33. Congress placed the age limit at 45. We permitted the President to make an age classification. He availed himself of that privilege by saying that men 38 and over should not be drafted at the present time.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct; but when Congress gave the President power to set the age limit at 38, it did so knowing that it might be necessary to exercise that power, and to that extent delegated the power to the President of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. That applies not only to age 38, but also age 30, or any other age which the President might choose.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. Congress gave to the President a very broad power. Of course, unless Congress had specifically delegated that power to the President, he would not possess it.

In the past, with a few minor exceptions, the Congress has definitely refused to legislate on any class basis. The basis upon which the Congress has legislated has been in the national interest and

what the individual citizen was doing, what contribution he was making to the war effort, and whether or not the place in which he was occupied afforded him the best opportunity to make his greatest contribution to the war effort. In the pending bill we are asked to change that policy, to do violence to the fundamental concept of the Selective Service Act, and to proceed to defer, or remove from liability for armed service, a class of men, not on the basis of what they are doing, not on the basis of what contribution they are making to the war effort, but because they have a particular personal situation, namely, that of being fathers.

Up to date the Congress has not attempted in any way to interfere with the grand strategy or plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the high command. On the contrary, the Congress has magnificently supported the high command in every way. We have provided for them all the money for which they have asked. We have given them the legislation which they have said was necessary for the winning of the war. We have upheld their hands in every particular. Now, as I have said, for the first time we are confronted with the momentous decision as to whether or not we shall interfere with the plans of the high command, whether or not we shall set our judgment above the judgment of the high command, and whether, to a certain degree, at least, the Congress shall take over the military direction and control of our war effort.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not understand that we left anything to the high command.

Mr. HILL. Yes, we left to the high command—

Mr. TAFT. We delegated to the President of the United States the power to classify men. We indicated that the whole selection should be made on civilian basis, by civilian boards. We have never for a moment attempted to say that the Army may decide whom it will take and whom it will not take in the draft.

Mr. HILL. No; of course we have not done so; but the President of the United States is the highest of the high command. Under the Constitution of the United States the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. We have, as I have already said, supported the Commander in Chief and all the high command. We have supported them in legislation for which they have asked. We have supported them by giving them all the billions of dollars which they have said was necessary for the winning of the war.

Now, for the first time, we find ourselves confronted with the situation of being asked to interfere with the high command, not supporting the high command, but forcing them to accept our judgment rather than their plans and their well-considered judgment.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In order to make certain that I understand the Senator

from Alabama, may I undertake to restate in my own words the point which I think he is seeking to make?

Is it not a fact that we have given to the President the power to defer men by classes?

Mr. HILL. That is correct with certain limitations.

Mr. DANAHER. We have given to him the power to defer specifically by classes.

Mr. HILL. We gave him the power to defer by classes. That is correct with certain limitations.

Mr. DANAHER. That being the fact, and that being the law, the President has the power this very minute, by the stroke of a pen, to decide that it is expedient and wise to defer all married men who have children.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama further yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama further yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I am seeking to elicit from the Senator from Alabama an outline of his position so that I may follow him in his argument.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to know whether the President, having the power to defer by class, may defer any age group which he chooses to defer.

Mr. HILL. I should say that he could defer any age group.

Mr. DANAHER. May the President defer a group on the basis of dependency?

Mr. HILL. Yes; he may. In fact, that is what was done when fathers were deferred.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to read to the Senator section 5 (e), paragraph 1, of the Selective Service Act, as amended June 23, 1942, which provides, as follows:

The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes.

So I think the Senator is mistaken in saying that the President is unable to defer men by reason of their family relationships.

Mr. HILL. The local board, under the authority of the President, has to make the determination. That is exactly what has been done. That is the reason fathers have not been called up today. We have been doing that very thing.

Mr. TAFT. The section to which I have referred provides that the President is also authorized to provide for such deferment. The obligation is on the local boards, but the responsibility for deciding whether fathers shall be deferred is now on the President of the United States.

Mr. HILL. The President of the United States has been deferring them,

through the local boards, on that very basis.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it not true that the reason we have classes which are called II-A, or II-B, or III-A, or III-B, is that the President has created such classes under the power Congress gave to him?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. Up to date he has created a class and deferred men under the provisions of the law cited by the Senator from Ohio.

General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, has advised Congress, through its Senate Committee on Military Affairs, that if the pending bill is passed and becomes law the Army will not get the men necessary to carry out the grand strategy and plans of the high command. As General Marshall has expressed it, such a reduction in the number of men as the bill contemplates would inflict heavier losses on our armed forces than could be anticipated as being caused by either Germany or Japan. General Marshall says that the result would be extremely serious and would inevitably lengthen the war.

Admiral King, in substance, agrees with what General Marshall has said. The Selective Service Administration, which is the agency for the procurement of men for the armed forces, tells Congress, through its Senate Committee on Military Affairs, that the needs for the armed forces between now and January 1, 1944, and even beyond that date, cannot be met except by drafting some fathers. The selective service estimates that in order to meet the demands of the armed forces between now and January 1, 1944, some 446,000 fathers must be drafted.

So, Mr. President, if Congress should pass this bill and it should become a law we would deny the selective service the right to draft 446,000 fathers, and the armed forces would be denied those men and would suffer the heavy losses about which General Marshall testified.

The Army is very hopeful that after January 1944 it will not need any additional men, except some 75,000 a month for replacement purposes. On the contrary, according to its present plans, the Navy will need for the 6-month period after January 1, 1944, approximately 92,000 men a month.

When we look at the figures we can well understand why the Selective Service says that the needs of the armed forces cannot be met except by drafting some fathers. I believe that anyone who has studied the operations of the Selective Service System from the very beginning, or who has either heard or read the hearings held at different times before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on the Selective Service System, and the amendments to the act embodying that System, will recognize that if the war is to continue—and there was faint hope that there would be an end to the war by this time—inevitably some fathers will have to be drafted into the armed forces. The drafting of fathers into the armed forces has been delayed just as long as possible, and today we have arrived at

the point where either we must draft fathers or fail to meet the needs of the armed services.

Altogether, on September 1 last there was a total of 22,212,000 registrants between the ages of 18 and 37, inclusive, under the selective system. Of the 22,212,000, constituting the pool from which the Selective Service must meet the needs and the demands of the armed forces, some 8,717,000 have already been inducted into the armed services or have enlisted. The 8,717,000 are not today all necessarily in the armed services. Some of them, of course, have been discharged for physical or other reasons, but that number, up to date, has been inducted or enlisted in the armed services.

The next classification is IV-F, embracing the mentally, morally, or physically unfit, constituting some 3,412,000. When a man has been rejected by the Selective Service because of being physically unfit, that does not mean at all that he will not be reexamined, and even reexamined the third time, in the effort to make use of him, if it be possible. Some men who have been rejected because of physical unfitness have been examined as many as five or six different times. There has been constantly a screening and rescreening of the physically unfit men in an effort to obtain and use as many of them as possible.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator tell me the number of men in the IV-F classification who have been examined five or six times?

Mr. HILL. I cannot give the number, but I will say that was the testimony of General White before the committee.

Mr. WHEELER. I know that was the testimony, but can the Senator give me the names of any individuals, who have been examined five or six times?

Mr. HILL. I cannot give the Senator the names of individuals; I have not attempted to secure the names of individuals; but I will say to the Senator that I shall be glad to ask both the Selective Service and the War Department for that information for the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. If any have been examined five or six times, I do not know of any such cases in my State or in any other State. I know that the Army at the present time has taken 5,000 of those in the IV-F classification.

I am getting letters from people from every section of the country, hundreds of them, saying that at the present time the Army is letting out of the IV-F classification many men who are physically fit, strong, and healthy, and who, when they return to their communities, are able to do a hard day's work. Yet it is sought to draft fathers. When the IV-F men who have been let out of the Army return to their communities, and the people there see them, strong, healthy, and able to do hard work, a very sad effect is created on the morale of the community. Frankly, I think that the Army is doing a great disservice to itself, and I think it is breaking down the morale of the people of the country.

It is all right to cite General Marshall, as the Senator has done, but I call attention to the fact that nowhere in General Marshall's testimony did he say that

the Army had to take fathers, but, on the contrary, he said that the Army preferred to have young single men.

Mr. HILL. There is no question that General Marshall did not say he wanted fathers.

Mr. WHEELER. He said he preferred not to have them.

Mr. HILL. But he said, in the most emphatic manner possible, that he had to have the number of men for which the Army plans call.

Mr. WHEELER. I know he said that; he said that he had to have men; but let me call attention to the fact that he said he had to have them to make up and to fill up certain divisions. If he is going to take men to fill up divisions for the purpose of sending them overseas, what will be the result? He will take fathers who will be sent to the various centers, and they will be used to fill up divisions that are going to be sent overseas, rather than to fill up such quotas from the 5,000,000 men who will be in the Army serving in this country at the end of this year, the vast majority of whom have had over 1 year's training, some of whom have had 2 years' training, and some of whom have had 3 years' training.

What does the Senator think the people of this country will say when the Army starts shipping overseas fathers who will have to leave their children, while there are in this country thousands of divisions and troops who have had from 1 to 2 years' training? Frankly—and I am speaking very sincerely—I am very much afraid that what will happen will be a break down in the morale of the people, which is so essential.

The Army looks at it from the standpoint of the Army alone, but it is your duty and my duty to look at this picture not merely from the standpoint of what the Army wants, for every Army officer wants the very best men he can get, the very cream of the men he can get, and the greatest number he can get; but it is your duty and mine and that of the Congress of the United States, and it should be likewise the duty of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, to look at the over-all picture. The Army does not look at the over-all picture; it never has looked at the over-all picture; it has always come to the Congress of the United States and asked for more money and larger and larger armies; but when it is said that we must follow blindly the Army because General Marshall says this is what we must have—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I want to be courteous to my friend from Montana; he was extremely courteous to me when he had the floor, but, if the Senator will excuse me, he made the same speech, I think, as my ears tell me, on 2 days last week.

Mr. WHEELER. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HILL. I repeat, I do not want to be discourteous; I want to yield to my friend and show him every possible consideration, as he showed me every possible consideration.

Mr. WHEELER. I let the Senator make innumerable speeches in my time.

Mr. HILL. But the Senator has made this same speech so many times I do not think it is necessary for him to make it again now in my speech.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to my distinguished friend that I think it cannot be made too often or brought home too often to the attention of the Commander in Chief himself.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, with reference to the question of the limited servicemen who are physically unfit for combat service, the Army today is taking as many of such men as it can. In addition to the men it is taking, who in the beginning did not meet the physical standards, every day other men in the Army are becoming less fit physically, and are, therefore, becoming disqualified for general or combat service. So today the Army has two sources of supply of men who do not meet the physical standards. One supply is being taken in directly from civilian life through the draft; the other supply is developing within the Army itself. Many men who 2 or 3 weeks ago landed at Salerno will not be discharged from the Army, but they will have suffered some kind of a physical disability which will mean that they will no longer be qualified for combat service or for general service, and such men will, therefore, have to do the work which can be performed by those who do not meet the physical standards.

In an efficient army such as we have, the army can make use of a certain number of men who do not meet the physical standards for combat duty. Our Army is doing that very thing today. According to the testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs, the Army is using as many as possible of the men who do not meet the physical standards; it is endeavoring to assign such men to places which they can fill, so as to release for combat or general service, men who are physically qualified.

The Senator from Montana referred to the fact that in many cases men who had been discharged from the Army and had returned home were doing hard work, and he suggested that such a situation had a bad effect on the morale of the people of the community. No doubt there are some men who have been released from the Army for physical disability who have returned home, and are doing, and are capable of doing, hard work, under the normal conditions they find at home, where they have their regular routine, their three meals a day at regular hours, where they sleep every night in their own beds, protected from shellfire and the many other things which a soldier in the Army has to endure.

It was stated in the hearings that a great athlete had been sent home as being physically disqualified. I made inquiry of the Surgeon General to determine why a man with his athletic prowess and his apparent physical perfection should be discharged from the Army. The Surgeon General advised me that this man was suffering from a perforated ear drum, and he stated that a man with a perforated ear drum would be readily susceptible to middle ear infection and to infection of the brain

covering and brain tissues when subjected to cold, damp weather.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. On the question of the IV-F's, I have just been talking with a leading doctor of the Ohio State University, one with rather a wide experience, particularly among persons suffering from deafness. He has been in the past the head of the School for the Deaf in Columbus.

According to General Hershey's testimony, last spring at least 109,000 men had been deferred because of deafness. That is 10 times as many as there are in all the institutions for the deaf in the United States. If this number comes out of 20,000,000, it indicates that there are in the United States some 500,000 men so deaf as to be incapable even of limited service.

The doctor to whom I have referred tells me that he has made examinations of men who have been deferred for deafness, and that of the last 27 he examined, 23 could hear just as well as the Senator or I. He said the Army's present tests for deafness are absolutely out of date, that they are wholly useless in determining whether or not a man is deaf; that in the giving of such a test it is very easy for a man to deceive; that of the men deferred for deafness, at least 75,000 are capable of at least limited service, most of them capable of active service. That is testimony from an expert.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that where the word "ears" is used as indicating that there is a physical defect, it would not necessarily mean deafness. There are other conditions, as in the case I have just cited, the case of the athlete who has a perforated ear drum, a condition which subjects him to the middle-ear infection, an infection of the brain covering and brain tissues when subjected to cold, damp weather.

Furthermore, while the reason given for many rejections may be ears, the men may be rejected for a number of different reasons. The doctors merely put down one ground on which a man is rejected, namely, his ears, but the man might have several other disabilities, as well as a disability arising in connection with his ears.

I think that if the Senator will look into hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs he will find that the committee endeavored to go into this matter. I know it did so far as the tests of mental disturbances were concerned, and it tried to make sure that the armed forces were making every effort possible to eliminate those who were shamming or malingering in order to make sure that the test which was given every man was a good test, and that if he had a physical disability, the disability would show up, and if he did not have a disability, he could not sham one and get off with the sham.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Under my amendment the President would be asked to set up a commission of five qualified physicians to go over the whole question of physical

qualifications. It seems to me that is a reasonable approach to the matter. It is more than likely that the testimony I have just given is true, that many tests used are out of date, and that in the natural course of events the Army Medical Corps has not obtained all the facts. I can see no reason why there should not be a commission appointed, outside the Army or Navy, but to some extent with their cooperation, to review this entire question. In this respect that is all my amendment suggests.

Mr. HILL. In connection with the policy of the Army and Navy, both attempt to work in the closest cooperation with the medical profession, particularly with the American Medical Association, because the American Medical Association is the great organization of the doctors of the country. If the Senator would investigate this matter, I am sure he would find that there are many committees from the American Medical Association, and doubtless from other medical associations, which are all the while sitting in and working with the medical men of both the Army and the Navy on the questions of qualifications, tests, and examinations.

One of the most distinguished officers in the Army Medical Corps today is General Rankin, from the State of Kentucky, who for awhile was one of the leading surgeons at the Mayo clinic. Afterward he left that clinic and went to Lexington, Va., and established a great clinic of his own. A year or two ago he was president of the American Medical Association. He was called into the Medical Corps of the Army as a colonel, and is now a brigadier general.

The purpose of calling in men such as General Rankin, and others whose names do not occur to me at the moment—I know of General Rankin as a recent president of the American Medical Association—is to bring to bear all possible skill and ability, in order that the Army may, insofar as possible, get men who are qualified, though physically disabled.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. When I was speaking to the expert from the Ohio State University to whom I referred, he called attention to the fact that in General Hershey's testimony it was stated that last year 400,000 were deferred because of mental diseases, 100,000 were deferred because of mental deficiency, and 157,000 for neurological reasons. That makes 657,000 men in the class of mentally deficient. That would indicate a total of that class in the country of between three and four million men. This doctor stated that such figures are absolutely incorrect, that such numbers do not exist, that the figures are not supported by any other testimony on mental deficiency in the United States, that they represent a hundred times as many as are confined in institutions for the mentally disabled, and that if there were any such number in this country, we might well give up the whole problem of caring for the mentally disabled, because it would be so tremendous. He says it is inconceivable that of the 20,000,000 examined 657,000 should be actually mentally diseased.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator in that connection that there has been a constant study made of the physical standards with the result that time and time again they have been lowered. When the Senator speaks of mental diseases, I will say that even since these figures have been compiled there has been another change in the mental standard, further reducing it.

In this connection I should like to call the Senator's attention to the testimony of Captain Thompson before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read his testimony; but he gave to the committee a most interesting description of the tests which are used in determining mental capacity. There are five different tests. All those who pass the first four tests are accepted. Those in the two highest levels in the fifth test are accepted. The Senator from Ohio is very much interested in this matter, and I wish to commend to him the testimony of Captain Thompson.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Alabama does not have any doubt, does he, that these mental tests have been used, in some instances, as a means of deliberate evasion of the selective-service law; in other words, that persons have deliberately prepared themselves to make a failure on the mental tests? I have been advised by a number of draft officials that it has come to their attention that men were deliberately preparing themselves to fail in the tests. I know during the last war a psychiatrist was sent to our division, and some of the sergeants apprehended men who were coaching each other on what might be called foolish questions and silly answers. The psychiatrist himself was crazy, and we finally talked him into reporting to the division commander that he was crazy, and got rid of him in that way.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Missouri that the committee went into the matter of malingerers rather carefully with Captain Thompson, and on page 157 of the hearings is found some of the testimony of Captain Thompson on this subject. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read Captain Thompson's testimony, but I will say that the committee was impressed with the thought that the Army, and for that matter, the Navy too, were doing all they could to prevent malingerers, and to prevent men from escaping the draft by shamming or faking.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have no doubt that the Army and the Navy are doing the best job they can do. I suggest only that if a commission is appointed under authority from Congress it seems to me it would approach the problem in a different way, in a way to see that the wishes which have been expressed by Congress are carried out. Although appointed under the proposal I make, by the President, who has the full power to appoint

anybody he wants, still the commission would feel a responsibility to Congress, specifically to see if it cannot avoid the drafting of married men by finding men in the tremendous group of 3,400,000 IV-F's who can take their place.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. While I look with favor upon the proposal made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] I wish to mention a matter which has come to my attention, and which I have looked into very carefully. The case was that of a man with a perforated ear drum. I could not quite understand why he was not in the service. In my investigation I found that he had tried to join the Army and was rejected. Then he went to the Navy and was rejected. He then applied to the Marine Corps and was rejected. Thereafter he went to practically every division of the armed forces, but was likewise rejected. Then he went to a private physician to see whether he could obtain some sort of report which would probably result in his being admitted into the armed forces, but he could not obtain it. He could not get into the armed forces. Therefore I do not believe we should cast a reflection upon one who had tried with all his heart to get into the service and failed simply because the examining officers had rejected him for such a disability as this man had, a perforated ear drum.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely correct. I know of no one who would in any way cast any reflection on any man because he had been rejected because of physical disability. Speaking of physical disability, frequently, as we know, a man who looks absolutely healthy and sound, who seems to be a hundred percent sound and without any physical disability, may be suffering from a very great physical disability which would show up on examination, or which he himself may know about, which he does not see fit to disclose. So by simply looking at a man one cannot always determine whether he has any physical disability or, if he has a physical disability, just what the disability is. The only way that can be determined is by a medical examination. So when a man discharged for physical disability returns to his home, those who reach the conclusion that he should not have been discharged certainly have no real basis or foundation for reaching such a conclusion. They do not know, and they cannot tell what his real condition is. The only way that can be ascertained is by examination of the medical findings.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. With reference to the matter of physical disability, I will say that I was not present in the Senate when a statement was made that physical requirements rule had been relaxed, I think, five times. That is my recollection.

tion of the statement, as I read it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Is that true?

Mr. HILL. I will say, Mr. President, there have been a number of relaxations of the rule with respect to physical standards.

Mr. WHERRY. Are the relaxations downward?

Mr. HILL. Yes. The effect of the relaxations has been to reduce the standards, to make more men eligible for service.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sending for my files. I received a communication from a draft board in northeastern Nebraska, which says that out of 32 men called for induction, 22 were sent back from the induction center in Omaha. I wish to place the letter in the RECORD, if the Senator will permit me to do so.

Mr. HILL. I will ask the Senator to place the letter in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I am intensely interested in the point on which the Senator is now dwelling. I am desirous of making up my mind concerning the matter. I should like to be convinced that the most available use is being made of our men who are physically disqualified. Recently I have received 5 or 6 letters dealing with this subject. The last letter, concerning which I spoke a moment ago, came in August, and told of 22 Nebraska boys out of 30 called for induction, who were sent back because they were physically disqualified. I cannot conceive of such a condition existing.

Mr. HILL. Was the letter written last August?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. Last August, I believe. As I recall, the number rejected was 22 out of 30 called.

Mr. HILL. That is within the past 60 days. Does the Senator from Nebraska know what their prior qualifications were?

Mr. WHERRY. I have received the letter now, and will read it.

Mr. HILL. Some of them, at least, may have been men who had already been rejected once, or perhaps twice, for disability, but in an effort to obtain as many men as possible, in an effort to defer the drafting of fathers as long as possible, they may have been sent back for induction, not once, but as I have suggested, several times. Some of the men might have been previously rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. The letter is dated September 14, 1943. It comes from South Sioux City, Nebr., and the man who signed the letter is J. J. Eimers. I read:

DEAR SENATOR: I note that the manpower matter is to be aired in Congress. I am a member of the draft board for this county, and suggest that Louis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, be interviewed on the subject. In a circular letter, of date August 21, 1943, sent to local board members, is the following paragraph:

"We have 2,976,000 IV-F's. We are constantly reworking that group and many are inducted every month. The possibility of recovery, however, from class IV-F is not great in the light of present physical standards of the Army and Navy. We shall continue to insist that class IV-F men be reconsidered and inducted where possible, but

most of these men will remain in class IV-F until the present physical standards are changed by the Army and Navy."

That is the end of the quotation, and that is the circular letter they received.

Now I continue the letter of Mr. Eimers:

At one time recently our board sent 32 men to Omaha for induction.

Mr. Eimers does not state the month when they were sent.

I continue to read from the letter:

They were all under 30 years of age; 22 of them were rejected. I have been peeved about this ever since. It appears that the Army is looking for supermen. Some of the rejections seem to me to be ridiculous.

There are some other portions of the letter, but I shall not take time to read them.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it seems to me from the letter, as I understood it, that some of the 22 men who were rejected had been previously rejected. I do not know how many times they had been rejected, but undoubtedly they had been previously rejected. So I think it is evident that that was not the first time the 22 men had been rejected. That board is evidently doing what other boards are doing—and I certainly do not condemn any of them for doing so—making every possible effort to defer as long as possible the induction of fathers, and therefore they have been trying to screen and rescreen the men who have been classified as physically disabled, and to obtain from the particular group every man who possibly can be obtained.

As I have said, the Army can use only a certain number of men who do not meet the physical requirements. There are only two classes of men who are subject to being qualified though physically disabled. One class is made up of those who come directly from civilian life. The other—and the longer the war lasts, the greater the number of men coming from the second source will become—is made up of those from combat units, men who are in the Army, but who fall below the physical standards because of wounds of battle or because of the stress and strain of Army life.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator's answer to me was somewhat based upon conjecture, and, of course, I am not sure that what the Senator says might not be true. However, I quoted the secretary of a draft board. He seems to feel that the rejections are due to the fact that the Army wants supermen.

Let me refer now to the situation at McCook, Nebr. The complaint coming from the draft board there is practically the same as the one I have already mentioned, although not involving the same number of men, of course. The letter is written by Mr. Max Merrell, secretary of the draft board at McCook, Nebr. It reads in part as follows:

We understand Congress intends to take some action on the selective-service question, especially so those factors in reference to the induction of fathers. We feel and we know the majority of the Members of Congress feel that this action should be delayed as long as possible.

From our experience on the draft board we offer you the two following suggestions which we think would relieve the situation for some period of time and also more evenly distribute the war burden over the 18 to 38-year-old class:

1. There are 228 IV-F men in this county who have been rejected by local doctors and the armed forces for physical defects.

That county is Redwillow County, which has a population of less than 7,000 persons.

The letter continues:

Most of these men are working in non-deferrable occupations, because these occupations can afford to pay well for these draft-exempt men. Give draft boards authority to draft these men into essential industries and thereby release physically fit men for the armed forces.

Mr. President, it seems to me that 228 is a large number of IV-F men in a county of only 7,000 persons. I want to bring the matter home to all of us, because what is largely true in my own experience is almost certain to be true in the State of the Senator from Alabama. I refer again to a local board. Our local draft board sent to Omaha, for induction, a young man by the name of Barker. His father served with me in World War No. 1, and rose from the rank of buck private to the rank of officer, and deserved a lot of credit for doing so. His son wanted to do what his father did: He went in the service as a buck private, although he was a graduate of Pawnee High School, and had been recommended for officers' candidate school. He was sent to Omaha, but was returned home. They said he had some slight difficulty with one ear. The boy had been captain of a football team. He played for 3 years alongside my boy at left tackle. During those 3 years of playing on football fields, he got more bumps than many soldiers will get. I can conceive of possible services in the Army where he might be hurt by high explosives and where he might not be useful; but certainly somewhere along the line that man is capable of rendering service to his country and desires to do so.

Mr. President, what about Frankie Sinkwich, who was sent back into civilian life the other day? I have followed football all my life. He was rejected after he had been trained in the Army, and yet according to yesterday's newspaper I notice that he accounted for three touchdowns at Detroit. What is the matter with him? After training him for all these months, is there not some place for him in the military service? Could he not take the place of some other man, and thus release the other man for more active service?

In reading more or less between the lines of the testimony of General Hershey, I received the following impression—I wonder if the Senator from Alabama received a similar impression—Is it not true that General Hershey would

favor a reduction of the physical requirements? Does the Senator know whether he would? The Senator is close to the situation.

Mr. HILL. In reply to that query, I will say to the Senator that General Hershey very frankly described himself before the Committee on Military Affairs as a salesman, a person who was trying to sell something.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. And with that viewpoint and with that obligation, he was endeavoring to have the Army and the Navy take all the men he could. However, he also said that if he were a field commander or a combat commander his viewpoint might be entirely different. He said he was a salesman, that his job was to try to get the market to dispose of as much of his product as possible, and therefore he was trying to get the market to take as much of his product as possible. However, he said if he were in the field as a military commander his viewpoint obviously would be different.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me say there is no dispute between the Senator from Alabama and myself about the military need. I am willing, with the Senator from Alabama, to go along with the Army number, even though they have to draft fathers or grandfathers, if it is a military necessity.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I am asking the Senator if in the Army of 5,000,000 men there are not active men who can be relieved by men in class IV-F. I have given instances of some outstanding men who were once inducted. We must rely on experience. My experience is that what the Army is asking for is supermen; and from the testimony of General Hershey I certainly got the impression that his view is that he would lower the standards still further, if necessary, in order to get the men needed for military service.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has referred to a man with a perforated eardrum; is not that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. Well, he had some difficulty with one of his ears.

Mr. HILL. This question has arisen before, and the War Department—more particularly, the Surgeon General—has expressed its views on the matter. Here is what the Surgeon General advises me:

A person with a perforated eardrum is easily susceptible to middle-ear infection and to infection of the brain covering and brain tissue when subjected to cold, damp weather. Damp conditions lead to flare-ups of acute inflammation in the middle ear, and necessitate hospitalization and lengthy treatment. Such infection leads to brain abscess or meningitis. Whether or not a person is an athlete has no bearing upon his susceptibility for infection as a result of perforated eardrums. Such persons are not acceptable even for limited service because limited service personnel go into the zones of communication and with combat troops in non-combat duty.

Now listen to this:

From July 1942 to January 1943, the War Department accepted persons with perforated eardrums for limited service against the advice of civilian physicians. The result was the filling of Army hospitals with per-

sons who had received infection as a result of the perforated eardrums.

Mr. WHERRY. But there are places where such a man could be used, to relieve another man. Let me give another illustration. This summer I visited a prison camp. I found in that prison camp 57 officers and 459 enlisted men, 10 doctors, and 30 nurses. There was a hospital of 150 beds. In the town in which the prison camp is located, a town with a population of 20,000, there is only a 36-bed hospital, and there are only 3 doctors to take care of the civilian needs. I asked whether or not the men in charge of the camp were limited-service men. The director of the camp said no, that those men were ready to do active duty. Certainly such a man as we have been talking about could fill the shoes of one of those men.

That brings up another question. Is manpower being efficiently used in the Army? I gather from the evidence that the War Manpower Commissioner admitted that there was a 25-percent waste of personnel within the Army.

Mr. HILL. The statement of the War Manpower Commissioner dealt only with the use of manpower in industry, and did not deal with the Army.

Mr. WHERRY. What about the Army? Does the Senator feel that 57 officers and 459 enlisted men are necessary to administer a prison camp with only 1,025 prisoners? If the barbed-wire fences were taken down, the prisoners would not run away. They love this country and from all indications would like to become citizens of the United States.

Mr. HILL. I am not so sure that they love this country. All I know is that certainly within the past few months they were doing everything possible to kill every American they could. Whether they have undergone a change of heart and now love us, I do not know; but the very reason they are prisoners in the camps is that they were soldiers, doing all they could to shoot and kill American boys.

I do not know the facts as to the particular prison camp to which the Senator refers. I am sorry the Senator did not inquire as to the number of men engaged in service at that prison camp who were limited-service men. As I have said, the Army can use a certain number of limited-service men. As I understand, one place where some of those men can be used is at prison camps. The Army is trying to use all the limited-service men it possibly can. It may be that this particular camp was set up overnight, and that in the beginning it was necessary to send in troops who were not limited-service men. It may be that it was necessary to send troops who were nearby and available at the time for that duty. It may be that they were sent there with the intention of relieving them as soon as possible, and that later limited-service men will be detailed to perform the necessary duty at that particular camp.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have any statement to make with regard to those who are educationally disqualified? Does the Senator have any figures showing the number, and does he know what the general provisions are?

Mr. HILL. In that connection let me recommend to the Senator that he read the testimony of Captain Thompson before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. I have before me a memorandum on the subject of illiteracy, but I hesitate to take the time of the Senate to read the entire memorandum.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me ask a further question. I think the Senator can answer it quickly. The Senator was a member of the subcommittee which considered Senate bill 637, which is a bill for Federal aid in education.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe the distinguished Senator, who did a good deal of work on that bill, will remember that the educational authorities interested in the bill came before us and asked for appropriations to educate boys and make them fit for military service. While I do not have the record before me, I am quite sure that the figure stated was approximately 800,000. Approximately 800,000 men were educationally disqualified for the armed services. I was surprised to learn that in my State the figure represented approximately 18 percent of all those who were eligible for the draft.

Let me give another illustration from my own home town, namely: A boy whose name I will not mention and who did not finish the country school. I suppose he would have a difficult time with higher mathematics or English composition; but he is as smart a mule trader as I have seen anywhere. He is not taken, although if I were in the front lines I would like to have him fighting alongside me. Are such boys being rejected and sent back home on the ground that they are not qualified? Such a man could be utilized. The man to whom I refer is physically fit, single, and 27 years of age.

Mr. HILL. The Senator says he could perform limited military service.

Mr. WHERRY. He certainly could.

Mr. HILL. As I have said several times previously, the Army is taking all the men with limited service qualifications that it can use. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the whole memorandum, or go into the whole story of illiterates, but I shall read the first paragraph of the memorandum from Captain Thompson, who testified before the committee. I hope the Senator will read his testimony. Captain Thompson said:

At the present time there are no restrictions on the number of illiterates who can be inducted into the armed forces. A man need not be able to read or write or speak the English language to be accepted by the Army or Navy, provided he is able to meet the required minimum intelligence standards.

The committee was very much interested in what those standards were. The distinguished Senator from South

Dakota was present at the hearing. We took a good deal of time to go into the tests which the Army and Navy are now giving to determine a man's intelligence and whether or not he can serve in the armed forces. We went into much detail. We had a number of demonstrations by Captain Thompson of the various tests, and I am sure that every member of the committee was impressed, as I was, by the fact that the tests are of the simplest kind. They are so simple that it does not seem to me possible for any man with anything like normal intelligence to fail to pass.

Mr. WHERRY. Is any provision being made to educate those boys within the Army?

Mr. HILL. I think an effort is being made to educate them. That is one job which is being done by the Army today. The Army has taken every man it could. The Army will take them if they are capable of learning, but have not had the educational opportunity. The Army is sending such men to school and teaching them so that they may become fit soldiers. Such schools are now being conducted throughout the country for men who have not had sufficient education.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have any figures as to the number of men who are now being educated?

Mr. HILL. With further reference to the Senator's query, let me read this paragraph from Captain Thompson's memorandum:

Illiterates who are inducted into the Army are sent immediately to special training units. At those units they are taught the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic, and are given some basic military training. The course extends over a period of 3 months. However, men who fulfill the requirements at any time prior to this period are sent to regular units for basic military training.

If a man can qualify before the 90 days have expired, he does not stay in school for 90 days. He is sent on for his basic military training. Every effort is being made to use illiterates. They are given an opportunity to learn.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator have any figures as to the number being educated?

Mr. HILL. The number now in school?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I do not believe I have that information, but I shall be glad to ask the War Department how many illiterates are now in the different Army schools.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be very glad to have the information.

Mr. HILL. I wish to speak further concerning the men who are unfit for military service. As I have said, the Army and the Navy are using all such men they feel they can possibly use. I believe the Army and Navy are to be commended in this respect: The Army has reduced the number of men it has asked for by some 563,000. It has done so on the basis of two conditions. One was the change in the military situation which came about when we took north Africa. That changed our military situation so that it enabled us to withdraw

from the Caribbean area troops we had to use there, not knowing what would happen so far as north Africa was concerned, so far as Dakar was concerned, and so far as other strategic places were concerned. Due to our conquest of north Africa, these strategic places were, at least for the time being, removed from the picture. On that basis, and on the basis of making the Army more efficient by reducing so far as possible all useless jobs, by employing every man on a needed and useful job, as well as causing every man to give his full cooperation and devotion to his job, the Army has reduced its originally proposed size by some 563,000 men.

The Army might have adhered to its original figure, including the 563,000 men, and taken in a large number of men who were physically disqualified. However, as officers of the Army have said, for an efficient Army it can use only a certain number of physically limited men. It does not want to take men unless it can use them, or unless there are places for them in the Army.

There is a vast difference between the conditions experienced by a man living at home where he has his routine and obtains a good sleep every night and the conditions a man may experience in the Army, where he may go for hours without sleep and without food, and where he may be subject to all the dangers and hardships of bombing, shells, fire, and vermin of all kinds. There is a vast difference between what a man can do at home under normal peaceful conditions, where he receives his food regularly and enjoys his regular sleep every night, and what he can do under the conditions of the Army. Many of the limited-service men will be used, not here at home to guard a prison camp, for instance, but they will go right up into the combat areas. Many of them will remain for days in the combat areas. Some of them will be stationed there as antiaircraft men. Some of the antiaircraft men are subject to more bombings and greater fire than men in the front lines. Some of them will be used as signal men at the front, and some will be assigned to the engineers in construction work. The fact that a man is confined to limited service does not mean that he will not be subject to fire and all kinds of danger.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator has stated that the Army has reduced its requirements and is now satisfied that an army of 7,700,000 men will be sufficient.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. That is so far as the present time is concerned. According to the figures given, that would require the drafting of 460,000 fathers in order to attain the required number of men.

Mr. HILL. The number would be 446,000. Allow me to say that a large number of those men will go to the Navy.

Some will go to the Army and some will go to the Navy.

Mr. TAFT. If that number of men are taken is there a reasonable hope that replacements after that time, in order to keep the number to 7,700,000, may be obtained from the 1,200,000 men who become of age every year, so that having obtained 446,000 fathers, there will be some reasonable hope that we may never have to draft the other million fathers who are said to be qualified within the physical requirements, and so forth?

Mr. HILL. There is a reasonable hope that, so far as the Army is concerned, that may be possible, provided the Army can obtain the 75,000 men needed for replacements each month among the younger men who are coming in from other sources. I do not think that would be a reasonable hope so far as the Navy is concerned because, according to the latest information which I have, for the 6 months' period from January 1, 1944, up to July 1, 1944, the Navy will need about 92,000 men a month, or a total of approximately 552,000. That figure is gross; it includes both the additional men and those needed for replacements in the Navy. However, I doubt that it will be possible during the 6 months' period from January 1, 1944, to July 1, 1944, to obtain each month the 75,000 men needed for the Army and some 92,000 which the Navy indicates it will need, without taking some fathers during that 6 months' period.

Mr. TAFT. However, there is some hope that if we—

Mr. HILL. I will say that there is a very definite hope that the Army will not ask that its size be increased beyond 7,700,000. As I have said, the plans called for, and Congress appropriated for, an Army of 8,200,000-and-some-odd men. Due to the change in combat conditions to which I have referred the Army found it possible to reduce its numbers by some 563,000 men, and there is a very definite hope that the Army will not, in this war, have to take more than 7,700,000 men. But that does not apply to the Navy. Concerning the Navy, let us remember, that for a long time the Navy did not receive any men through selective service. The Navy relied entirely on enlistments, and therefore, we naturally think of the selective service as being tied in more with the Army than with the Navy. In the future the Navy will require about 92,000 men a month for the 6 months' period from January 1, 1944, to July 1, 1944. The Army must have its quota of 75,000 men during that 6 months' period, and it seems that we shall have to draft fathers for the Navy.

Mr. TAFT. Has any study been made by the committee of the question of whether the Navy really needs 3,000,000 men? As I understand, that is about 3 times the size of any navy the world has ever seen, and I wonder if any study has been made of the need for a personnel of that size.

Mr. HILL. The testimony of Admiral King and of Admiral Jacobs was to the effect that if we are properly to man and use the ships and airplanes which will be coming off the ship lines and the

airplane lines during the 6-month period from January 1, 1944, to July 1, 1944, we shall have to have that number of men. I had in mind that later in my remarks I would discuss the subject, and it might be well to do so now.

Mr. TAFT. Will not that increase in the Navy figures fully offset the decrease in the Army figures of about five or six hundred thousand and bring the Navy figures above any that have ever been mentioned before in the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. HILL. I believe the Senator is correct in that respect. I believe that if the Navy obtains the number of men during the 6-month period which they now indicate they will need, it will offset the gain we made when the Army modified its plans so as not to take in the additional 563,000 men which the Army had originally planned to take.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of an army of 7,700,000 men, can the Senator tell us how many would be combat troops and how many would be noncombat troops?

Mr. HILL. As the Senator well knows, because he is a distinguished soldier himself—

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will not confuse this question by injecting any irrelevant matter.

Mr. HILL. I shall not confuse it, but I should like to say that the first time I had the honor and pleasure of meeting my good friend, the Senator from Texas, was during the last war when he and I were attending military school at Fort Meade, and one day found ourselves sitting on the same bench. I will say to the Senator that in this war it is extremely difficult to distinguish combat soldiers from noncombat soldiers. Our soldiers are really broken down into what might be called two classes, one of which is the combat class. Of course, it does not need any explanation to indicate what a man in that category does. He is the man in the air, the man on the ground with a rifle in his hands, or a man behind a 70-millimeter gun. Then, there is what is called the Service Command.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Florida will wait for a few moments, until I have answered the Senator from Texas, I shall be glad to yield to him.

As I was saying, the next category is what is called, as the distinguished Senator from Texas knows, the Service Command. The Service Command is made up of Antiaircraft men, Signal Corps men, engineers, men who serve at ports and load ships, men, it may be, who operate barges which convey our amphibious troops. These men are auxiliary to the combat forces and are classified as service troops.

Then, we have the third category, which we call household troops. Household troops are not used out of the United States. The combat troops provide for their own household arrangements, but in the camps located in the United States, where men and units and

divisions are trained, there are in the service those who are called household troops. They are the men who keep the camps going, who operate the water, light, and utility systems, who police the roads and camps, and who even see that the garbage is removed. They do many different things that have to be done at a camp. A camp is like a city, and, exactly as a city must have these different services, so a camp must have them.

I am not prepared to give to the Senator a break-down as to the combat services and the household services, but I wish to say to him that I have here a memorandum which at the present time is confidential which I should be delighted to have him or any other Member of the Senate see. If the Senator will read the memorandum, I think it will answer exactly the point he has in mind. I can understand why he has the question in his mind, and I shall be delighted to let him see this confidential memorandum.

Now I shall be happy to yield to my good friend from Florida.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, the question has been raised as to the great number of men who are in the Navy. The number of men now in the Navy is approximately 3,000,000. It is also true that in no time in history has the United States had to engage in battles on the seven seas, all around the world. Furthermore, most of our battlegrounds are 3,000 miles away from home. Thus a very large naval personnel is required. Is not that the reason why there are so many in the Navy?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Florida is exactly correct. I had thought that a little later on in my remarks I would speak briefly along the line he has suggested. The Senator has put his hand on the heart of the problem which I fear many of us have permitted to escape our attention.

Mr. President, we cannot compare our relative strength in soldiers or in naval personnel with the relative strength of some other nation and obtain anything like the picture we ought to have to guide us in our deliberations and in our judgment, unless the factors that enter into the respective situations are the same; unless the other nations' problems are approximately the same as our problems.

We are at war today with Germany; we are at war with Japan; but our problems are entirely different in many particulars from the problems of Germany and Japan. As the Senator from Florida so well brought out, our supply lines are 5,600 miles long. All those supply lines have to be guarded and protected, as the Senator from Florida has indicated. Our Air Force today is fighting on 10 different fronts, and, remember, every front has to be considered not only so far as the men actually operating on it are concerned, but also the men needed to maintain the men operating on the front, and the necessary reserves. Germany, operating on small interior lines, can ship her reserves from one front to another without extreme difficulty and without any great delay. Today Germany can ship air power from

the Russian front into Italy in a few brief hours perhaps, without any great trouble. We cannot ship to the Italian front our air power from New Guinea or from the Solomons or even from the United States without great trouble, delay, and burden. That means that the Italian front has got to have far more in the way of reserves on our side of the line than Germany has to have on her side of the line, because, as I have said, the Germans can bring reserves in much more quickly and much more readily than we can send reserves to Italy, for our reserves have to cross thousands of miles of ocean, whether they come from the United States or whether they come from the Pacific. The reserves, however, must be there. They must be there for two reasons.

They must be there in the event unexpected force is brought to bear against our forces in that particular field of operations. We must have reserves and be able to call upon them in the event they are needed. If the enemy makes an unusual thrust there, if he is able to employ more force than the regular combatant troops can meet, we have got to bring in reserves, to hold the line, to save the line, and to save our troops in the combat line.

In the second place, when we make a thrust into the enemy line if we are to derive the benefit from such an operation and obtain victory, we must send in reserves to take advantage of the opportunity which may be afforded. If a combatant front is denied reserves, there occurs exactly the thing that happens as when the gong sounds in a boxing bout. When one boxer has the other boxer groggy, if the gong is rung, the man who is about to give the knock-out blow is stopped from giving it. The reserves are used to give the knock-out blow. They are the forces that bring and insure victory. Our forces are scattered all over the face of the earth, with supply lines 5,600 miles long, with various fronts and theaters of operation, and our problems are entirely different from the problems of our foes.

We hear of manpower. The testimony shows that even with Italy out of the war the Axis Powers now have only 14 divisions less than have the United Nations.

Mr. BARKLEY. The testimony was they had only 14 divisions less than they had a year ago.

Mr. HILL. I understood there were only 14 less than today.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Axis have only 14 divisions now less than they had a year ago, notwithstanding the fact that Italy is out of the war.

Mr. HILL. Either situation shows how they have combed their manpower, and how they have built up their divisions. But, as I have said, we cannot compare by divisions or numbers of troops. We have to base our plans, we have to make our decisions, as the Senator from Florida so well brought out, on what the respective problems are.

What are the problems? Germany today has no transportation problem in the sense in which we have one. No troops

of Germany have to be sent over thousands of miles of water. Our problems are entirely different from those of Germany.

Much has been said about air power. Practically everything we have done up to date, with the exception of knocking Italy out of the war, has been in the effort to secure and hold air bases from which we could reach the enemy with air power. What was the great purpose of the Italian campaign? Certainly after Italy went out of the war one of the great purposes, I should say the paramount purpose, was to get air fields so that we could use our air power against Germany.

Another thing we have to consider is that Hitler and Japan started their preparations for the war in 1933—10 years ago. They have trained and retrained, and then trained their troops further, while we feel we are doing very well if we are able to train one of our combat outfits a year before it meets the enemy in battle. We have to consider the training our enemies have been able to give their men, the long period of superior training their men have received.

There are many such factors which have to be considered, which we can think about and know about, and then there are many others about which we cannot and do not know. The only ones who can make the decisions are those who have knowledge of these matters. There is no man on this floor who really knows what the military situation is throughout the world. To know that, we would have to have information about China, which we do not have; we would have to have information about Russia, which we do not have; we would have to have information about Britain, which we do not have; we would have to have the information about all our other allies, which we do not have, and then we would have to have a great deal of information about our own forces which those outside the high command do not possess.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think anyone is disposed to question 10,800,000 men as the number the two services of the country require. I asked whether anyone had looked into the Navy figure, 3,000,000, to ascertain whether that figure included some who were tentative members of the Navy, or reservists, or on what basis the figure was made. I suppose the Committee on Military Affairs would not have jurisdiction of that question.

Mr. HILL. We exercised jurisdiction, when we had the hearings recently on the pending bill, to question Admiral King and Admiral Woodson about the Navy's need for 3,000,000 men; but, of course, we did not go into the subject as the Naval Affairs Committee might have done, taking merely that one subject and going into all its different ramifications, and securing all the information on it.

Mr. TAFT. The vital question is not that of the number of men at all, but

who is to go first. It seems to me that on that question Congress has a perfectly legitimate right to go into the whole problem.

Mr. HILL. Whereas I am not for the Senator's amendment, I think the Senator's amendment makes clear his position; that is, that while he is not for the pending bill, he is not going to try to do anything which might deny men to the armed forces, but his amendment does set up certain categories, and requires the armed forces to take the men according to the categories prescribed in his amendment.

Mr. President, if I may return to the question of physically disqualified men, I may say that the committee questioned General Marshall, Admiral King, Admiral Jacobs, and General Hillman, of the Surgeon General's Office, War Department, to see if any way could be found to lower the requirements. The answer came back from all those men that they felt that the armed forces had reduced the physical standards just as far as possible, and that they did not see how there could be further reductions of such standards.

The next group of men are those in II-A category, sometimes described as irreplaceable, necessary men engaged in activities in support of the war effort. This group includes industrial workers. It also includes men in our transportation systems, men in the utility systems, men employed by city governments, such as policemen, firemen, and men of that kind. It includes students whom the Army is sending to school, and some who have been temporarily deferred. It also includes Federal employees. The II-A group includes the men who have been deferred because of occupation, and the sum total of that group is 1,508,000.

Mr. President, much has been said about Federal employees. They are in this group. I think some of the loose and inaccurate and irresponsible statements which have been made about Federal employees in the draft have been very unfair. To hear some of the statements one would think that the Federal Government today was a haven for draft dodgers, that it was a refuge for men who were shirking their duty to their country, and who were using their jobs in the Government in order to escape the draft. Such statements have been unfair, first and foremost, to the Federal employees, the countless thousands of honest, devoted, and patriotic men and women who are carrying on the manifold duties of our Government, many of which duties contribute directly to and are a part and parcel of the war effort. Blanket indictments against such employees, or anything that appears to be blanket indictments against them, are absolutely unjustified and without any basis in fact or in figure. It was unfair to the people back home, to the mothers and fathers of the boys who are now in our Army, and particularly to those who are now on our battle fronts, to give the idea that while their sons were out fighting and enduring all the travail, hardship, and danger of battle, here in Washington

the Federal Government was a refuge for draft dodgers, and that there were many men protected within the Federal Government from selective service and from doing their part in the armed forces of the United States.

The figures show that of the millions of employees in the Federal Government today there are about 115,000 deferred because of their occupations in the Federal Government. Of course there are others in the Federal Government who have been deferred for other reasons, some for physical disabilities, some because they are fathers, but such men would have been deferred no matter where they might have been employed. They would have been deferred if they had been making any contribution whatever to the war effort. Only about 115,000 have been deferred because of their work for the Government. Of that number, 51,875 are employees of the Navy Department, 30,423 are employees of the War Department, the War Shipping Administration has 7,409, and the Maritime Commission 4,309. Altogether in the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Shipping Administration, and the Maritime Commission 94,016 men have been deferred because of the work they are doing in the Government service. Some of these men are working in our navy yards, such as the navy yard at Norfolk. Not many months ago I went to Norfolk to witness the launching of one of our greatest battleships, the battleship *Alabama*. That battleship had been built by the Government with its own employees. In our arsenals many of the men who are deferred are building guns and making ammunition for our forces. They are men in key positions in the arsenals of warfare.

Only about 21,000 have been deferred in Government agencies other than the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Shipping Administration, and the Maritime Commission. Many among the 21,000 are engaged directly in the war effort. They may be engineers. Civilian engineers landed with our forces at Salerno so that they might as quickly as possible prepare and make ready for our air forces airports in Italy. Some are with the Coast Guard. Some are working with the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Some are making absolutely necessary maps in different parts of the world for our armed forces. Some are making delicate instruments for our fliers so they may have the best possible information about the weather. They are, with few exceptions, engaged in some vital war work.

If we should take the entire 21,000, in addition to those who are directly engaged in the war agencies, and they were examined, out of that number it would be found that perhaps not over 10,000 or 11,000 would meet all the requirements, including physical, for service in the armed forces.

Mr. President, there have been no more grossly unfair statements than those with reference to the Government being a refuge for draft dodgers. A few such cases may be found here and there, and

where found, of course, the men affected should be inducted into the service. As I said on the floor of the Senate the other day, since July 1, under the Maybank-Lodge Act, the selective service each month has been obliged to file with the Congress a list of the names of all Federal employees who are deferred, the reasons why they are deferred, and the draft boards which have deferred them.

An examination of the requirements for deferment in the Federal Government shows clearly that it is far tougher and far more difficult to be deferred because of occupation in the Federal Government than it is because of occupation in industry, or in any other operation which is either directly or indirectly connected with the war effort. If a Federal employee is wise and wants to avoid the draft he will get out of the Federal Government and into industry, because unless he is engaged in the most vital piece of work for the war effort he will surely be drafted.

As to men in industry, as of July 31 this year there were 1,553,000 men deferred because of their occupation in industry. According to the estimates of the Selective Service, if these men were put through the physical and other examinations which a man has to stand before he can be admitted to the armed forces, of the 1,553,000 men there would perhaps be only 775,000 who would qualify and who would be acceptable to the armed forces. Only 775,000 men who are qualified are today deferred in industry.

The question is whether we can take keymen from our airplane plants, keymen from our shipbuilding plants, men from our machine-tool plants, men from plants which are so absolutely necessary to the war effort, and place them in the Army without hampering and jeopardizing our production. Last week there was held in Washington a meeting of the council of the aircraft producers of the country. The council adopted a resolution deploring the fact that some men had already been taken out of the aircraft industry to go into the armed forces, and pleading that no more keymen be taken from the aircraft industry. It stated that if more of them were taken from the industry there was bound to be an impairment of aircraft production, and that the aircraft industry could not possibly meet its schedules.

In all such cases the War Manpower Commission, the Selective Service System through its local boards, and management, are supposed to be making every effort possible to obtain replacements. In other words, if a man can be found or if a man can be trained to take the place of a draft-age man employed in industry, he is put in, and the other man now in the particular place is released for the armed forces. But we cannot go into the war industries and take these men out except there be replacements, unless we want seriously to impair and hinder the production of the war materials of the country.

While I speak of replacements, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the point that the fact that a replacement

is needed or the fact that a replacement is wanted does not mean there necessarily will be a replacement. In order to have a replacement, the man who is to do the replacing must be ready, willing, and capable of doing the job. So it is all very well to talk about replacements; but unless there are replacements ready, willing, and capable, replacements cannot be made.

While we consider the situation in industry, I think we should also recall the fact that when this great program was first started under the impact of the attack at Pearl Harbor, speed was the great need of the hour; the demand was to produce things, to produce them right away, to get the airplanes and ships as speedily as possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Overton
Andrews	Guffey	Pepper
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hatch	Reed
Ball	Hayden	Revercomb
Barbour	Hill	Reynolds
Barkley	Holman	Robertson
Bucks	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maloney	Wallgren
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Eastland	Moore	White
Ellender	Murdoch	Wiley
Ferguson	Murray	Willis
George	Nye	Wilson
Gerry	O'Daniel	
Gillette	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ADDRESSES BY SENATORS RETURNING FROM THE FIGHTING FRONTS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish the attention of the Senate for a moment to make an announcement concerning a change in the program heretofore announced.

It had been arranged to have Members of the Senate who made the trip abroad address the Senate at 2 o'clock on Wednesday in closed session. After discussing the matter with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and other Senators, it has been thought wiser not to interrupt the proceedings of the Senate by having those addresses at 2 o'clock on Wednesday, but instead to begin at once at 12 o'clock on Thursday. Therefore, the program is changed to that extent.

The closed session will be held on Thursday immediately after the convening of the Senate, rather than at 2 o'clock on Wednesday.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at the time of the quorum call, I was referring to the situation in industry, and the question of replacements. In this connection, I think it ought to be said, so far as replacements, hoarding, shortages, and employment in industry are concerned, that no one has any power to make any worker do anything he does not want to do. No one can say to a worker, "You must work in this particular plant. You must go into this plant and replace some one else. You must do this particular job."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator read any of the mandates issued by the War Manpower Commission?

Mr. HILL. I am coming to those. The War Manpower Commission, without any control over the individual, has been doing everything it possibly could to take care of the matter of replacements, and deal with the question of hoarding, shortages, and employment. It has worked out several plans. As I recall, it first had the so-called Baltimore plan; then more recently the so-called Buffalo plan; and now the Byrnes or Baruch plan is being tried in the aircraft plants on the west coast.

Through these various plans the War Manpower Commission has been doing everything it could, as I understand, and as the testimony will show, to get men into the proper places, and to get them to stay in the proper places and make the largest possible contribution to the war effort.

However, as I have said, the War Manpower Commission cannot say to John Smith, "You are an aircraft worker. Go to the Boeing plant. We have a job there for you. You must take that job and stay on the job. You must work so many hours a day in that job." If John Smith says to the War Manpower Commission, "I am not fit to take that job, and I am not going to take it," I do not know of any power under the law which can compel him to go into that plant and take that job. In our consideration of the subject of employment in industry, we must bear in mind that there are indirect sanctions which can be brought to bear on management and employee, but there is no power to force a man to work in an industry.

It is all very well to talk about hoarding, and to make charges and statements with reference to it, and I agree that such conditions ought to be eliminated so far as possible, but there are definite limitations, very great limitations, which have been placed on the

authority of the Manpower Commission to handle these different situations. As we know, in England, Australia, and New Zealand, universal service acts have been enacted, and under those acts the government may tell a man where he shall work, or where he shall serve, to the same extent as under our Selective Service Act the Government may tell a man what he shall do in the Army and where he shall serve in the Army. Under those acts every citizen is subject to the control and absolute dictation of the government. We do not have that kind of a law. We still have our private-enterprise system, and under it now—as from its beginning—each man, as it has often been said, is a sovereign. Every citizen is a sovereign. He does what he pleases so long as he does not step on the toes of his neighbor. That is the situation today. So far as industry is concerned, and so far as our civilian population is concerned, there is no service act or power by which the Government can force anyone to do anything he does not want to do.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I agree that there is no power to compel a man to do anything he does not want to do, but I say that today the War Manpower Commission is saying to a man in Cincinnati, for instance, "You stay in this plant. We will not allow any other employer to employ you. You have got to stay here."

Mr. HILL. I say that is an indirect method of approach, but I am glad it is being done, and I think more of it ought to be done.

Mr. TAFT. In so doing, the Commission is usurping a power which I agree with the Senator they do not have.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am glad they are doing it, and they have my good wishes in doing it. What I am saying is that if the man says, "Well, I am not going to do what you want me to do," and thumbs his nose at the Manpower Commission, all the Manpower Commission can possibly do is to prevent him from obtaining a job in some other plant. The Manpower Commission cannot compel him to work in a particular place if he does not wish to work there.

Mr. TAFT. They could starve him into staying there.

Mr. HILL. I do not think they could starve him into staying there, and I shall explain why. There are many opportunities for a man to work and make a living outside of industries which are under the control of the Manpower Commission. A man may obtain a job at some crossroads grocery store, for example, and eat out of a cracker box. The Manpower Commission might make it inconvenient and uncomfortable for him, but they have no direct power over him. That is one thing which we have to bear in mind at all times in our consideration of the question under consideration and of the matter of replacement. Someone may say, "Let us replace these men and get them into the armed forces," but no one has the power to say to any man, "You have got to go

into this plant and replace another man."

Much has been said on the subject of the hoarding of employees. The record shows that in the shipbuilding plants the manpower hours required per unit have been reduced 35 percent. Management has cut down the number of men required to build a particular ship, or to do a certain job in a shipbuilding plant. The number of men required to do the work has been cut down one-third. On the whole, that speaks pretty well, I think, for management. In the aircraft industry the manpower hours per unit have been reduced 25 percent, or one-fourth.

To hear some of the statements which have been made relative to hoarding, one would think that management in this country is doing everything it can to place men on the pay rolls and to cause them to be falling over each other, and that the men cannot work because they are getting into each other's way.

The record, however, shows that instead there has been an average reduction in the number of persons employed in our shipbuilding plants and in our airplane plants for the particular job to be done. I do not doubt that in some plants there is some hoarding of employees, but the figures would indicate that, on the whole, that is not the true situation. On the contrary, they indicate that most of the persons working in such plants are doing an honest and necessary job, and that they are located where they certainly ought to remain until some replacements can be provided for them.

In our system today there is no such thing as a cost-plus contract. We do have cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. It will be recalled that during the last war we paid some contractors a percentage on the amount of the contract. That, of course, resulted in an incentive to pile up the costs as high as possible, because the contractor's fee was a percent of the cost. Today the Government makes contracts in which it permits the costs to vary, but not the fee. The fee is fixed. The fee being fixed there is no incentive to hoard more men than are necessary.

On the other hand, I must admit that the cost being variable, there is no incentive for the contractor to reduce it, as he would be inspired to do if there were a ceiling on the cost. I, for one, hope that we may get away from cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts as quickly as possible. I am not sure that within 24 hours' time we could terminate all such contracts, but I believe that every possible effort should be made to return to the old competitive bidding system.

According to all the testimony given before our committee, and according to the statement which was made by the Aircraft Industrial Council which met in Washington last week, the main trouble, so far as the wastage of manpower in industry is concerned, is turn-over. The average turn-over in our manufacturing plants today is said to be 84 percent. The Aircraft Industrial Council said that in the aircraft industry the turn-over was running 100 percent.

That represents an increase from 84 percent to 100 percent in 1 year's time. Maximum efficiency and the best results cannot be obtained from manpower with that kind of a turn-over. Yet, as I have said, we are faced with the situation that no one today, not even the Government of the United States, has the power to say to a person, "You must work on this particular job." No one can compel any citizen in this country to work or remain on any particular job.

The percentages to which I have referred run high, and I think that one reason for that is the very high turn-over rate among women. Of course, more and more women are being employed in industrial plants.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The evidence seems to me to be abundant, that there is a high rate of turn-over in industries, and also that there is a hoarding of labor in various industries, as well as in the departments of Government. The representatives of the Government handling war contracts certainly ought to make a complete check-up in the various war plants. They ought to send someone into the plants to check up on them, and wherever men are being hoarded the Government should take them out. That is one thing the Government can do.

Mr. HILL. There can be no disagreement between the Senator and me on the question of hoarding. I think the Government should make every possible effort to eliminate every man in industry who is not necessary on a job, or who is not making the full, necessary contribution on the job.

I certainly would not be disposed in any way to speak except in the most complimentary terms about the local selective-service boards, of which there are some 6,500 throughout the United States. I think on the whole they have done a very fine job and, as we know, they have received no compensation or reward whatever for their work. They have done everything gratis. They have had many headaches, no doubt, for it has been a very disagreeable and troublesome job for them most of the time. They deserve great credit for what they have done. However, after all, these matters in most cases head up in the local boards. The local boards determine whether or not a man is really necessary in a given plant in a particular community.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me suggest that the able Senator is wrong with reference to the local boards. I call attention, first, to the fact that Colonel Keesling testified before the committee that the boards deferred men in industry when it was said that they were irreplaceable. Men go from the various States of the Union, from Montana and almost every other State, to California for instance. They obtain a statement from the foreman of the plant where they work that "This man is working in industry."

The local board then defers him, but the local board at home, the local board

in Montana, or the local board in Alabama, or the local board in some other State cannot tell whether or not that man is doing an efficient job in a shipyard in California or whether another man is doing an efficient job in Connecticut or some other State. That the local boards accept such certificates is one of the great troubles. The local boards told the men from one end of the country to the other, "Get jobs in industries, and you will be deferred." The result was that young men, single men, went into industry. They were attracted by big wages and by the fact that they would be deferred from the draft. They went to various places and filled jobs in defense plants, and now it is said they are essential to industry. On the other hand, the married man, the father, remained at home taking care of his home and doing the work in which he was engaged. He did not want to lose his job. So, because of the mistakes the Government has made in that respect, now it is proposed to draft fathers.

Mr. HILL. Let me say, in answer to what the Senator has stated, that what he says is true in many particulars. As I said, I think the local boards deserve great credit, for they have done a wonderful job. They have had their difficulties. A board in Montana has difficulty in passing on a man, say, who has come from Birmingham, Ala., to work in a plant in Montana.

It is my understanding that under the present regulations of the Selective Service with reference to replacements there is no reason why the local board in Montana should not communicate with the local board in Birmingham, Ala., to have that local board, that knows the local situation, ascertain the facts about a particular man. That has been one of the difficulties with which the local board has been confronted. In many cases the local boards have sought, I know, to find out the status of a man who has left the State and gone into some other State, so that it would be able accurately and fairly to pass on his case.

Now, with reference to the young men going into industry, that is true in many particulars, too. As I was about to say at the time the quorum was called, we have had two stages with reference to industry and production. First was the stage when speed was the prime essential. We had to get airplanes because we did not know but that the Japanese might attack the west coast. We had to get ships, we had to get guns, and I can tell the Senate now we even had to get gunpowder. So there was haste, and haste makes waste. The shipbuilding plants and airplane plants and other war plants multiplied manyfold in a few weeks' time; some of them multiplied hundreds percent. What did they do? They got the most available men; they reached out and got the men they could get the quickest. It was the natural thing to do. Naturally, more men were found available among the young unmarried men than among the group that was married, who probably had homes and fixed residences, and perhaps had jobs which they had held for some time. We

were trying to get men to go into the airplane plants in Los Angeles, Calif., and so other States were combed in the effort to get the most available men to meet the situation at that time, to meet the demand for speed which was so necessary, that the younger men, many of them, as I have said, unmarried men, were placed in industry.

Now we have reached the second stage when the great compulsion for haste no longer exists, but we can get the maximum use out of our manpower and insofar as possible not draft any more fathers than may be necessary. That is our problem today.

But, as I said, as to the younger men, we want to replace them as rapidly as possible; but a man cannot be replaced until there is found someone else who is ready and willing and capable of going in and taking his place in a factory.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator see any objection to the proposal made in my amendment that, in addition to the home board passing on the question, a selective-service board at the location of the work—I care not whether a local board or a board of appeals in the city where the work is done—also pass on the question before a man can be deferred?

Mr. HILL. I was about to suggest to the Senator that, instead of having a local board in the particular area in which the man works pass on the question, it might be better to have it passed on by an appeal board.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator see any objection to tightening up the business of deferring for industrial purposes and giving some jurisdiction to a board where the work really is done and which can examine the character of work being performed?

Mr. HILL. No, I want to say to the Senator I see no objection to a tightening-up process. The fact is if there is any way of tightening it up, without too much loss of manpower or delay as the result of the tightening, I am strongly in favor of a tightening; I want to tighten it. If there are any men in these classes who are not necessary in industry and who are eligible for the draft, I want to get those men out of industry and into the armed services where they belong.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that my amendment, or a part of it, perhaps with some modifications, will meet the Senator's desire in that respect.

Mr. HILL. I want to thank the Senator for commending to me his amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I want to thank the Senator for saying that something of the kind is needed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to clear up the statement made by myself relative to the use of men in the IV-F classification. I hope the Senator, in his closing remarks, if he can do so, will present

figures to show that the Army is using IV-F men to the greatest possible extent.

I desire to quote a short paragraph from the testimony of Colonel Keesling before the subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee on September 9 and 10:

One of the matters that you, Senator—

I think he was speaking to the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]—

One of the matters that you, Senator, wanted me to discuss, as I recall it, was the possibility of utilizing these IV-F rejects, either individually in war-effort work if they are not already in it, or by having them go into a special corps, which would be either a part of the War Department or auxiliary to it, so that it would be semimilitary, or completely military, or completely civilian, and that corps, perhaps, could be a mobile crew that could move here and there. In that connection, speaking just personally, I believe that if you are going to have to have some group make sacrifices, if you feel you are not going to be able to improve certain jobs beyond a certain point, and if labor, management, and everybody agrees on that, namely, that wages can't be raised and working conditions can't be better for some jobs because of circumstances, then if those jobs have got to be done to win the war, the questions of how many do you need to do the jobs, and what is the right selective basis for choosing those whom you are going to call on voluntarily or otherwise, are very important and must be answered in either event. Most people would be satisfied, including the people themselves who are called, if the proper types are selected and called.

This is the point I wish to suggest to the Senator:

There are psychological reasons why some persons themselves would wish to go in. I think the IV-F's are about in that position, particularly the young single ones. I know a number, particularly the young single fellows, who, but for their physical condition, would have been in the service. They feel very embarrassed, particularly if they are not in war effort work. If they get into the war effort work then they feel all right psychologically. If they are not in, I think something should be done by a voluntary appeal, or maybe there should be some compulsion involved.

The point I am making is this: Why cannot those who are rejected in class IV-F, which now constitutes nearly 3,500,000, because of standards which have not been reduced as much as I feel they should be reduced under the showing made, be enlisted in the service at this time, before anyone else is taken, whether fathers, or even grandfathers, so far as that is concerned?

Mr. HILL. The witness whom the Senator was quoting was talking about a corps which would be semimilitary, or completely military, or completely civilian, which would be either under the War Department, or auxiliary to it.

Sometime earlier in the day I spent sometime discussing the IV-F classification, and I hesitate to go over the discussion. I stated that, so far as the Army was concerned, General Marshall and the other spokesmen for the Army and Navy have said that there was a certain number of limited-service men whom the Army could use, and that the Army were using and would use the maximum number of them.

I also called attention to the fact that the Army had two sources of supply for these limited-service men. One was to take them directly from civilian life, through the selective service, taking in today about 5 percent of the limited-service men. The other source of supply, which source will get larger and larger all the while, is made up of the men who went in physically qualified, meeting the general standards, but who, due to injury in battle or some other injury suffered, or due to some physical disability which has developed because of the stress and strain of Army life, would fall into this limited-service class.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I spent nearly an hour this morning discussing the limited-service question, and I do not want to go over it again. Let the Senator from Nebraska finish, then I shall yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHERRY. I have here the report of the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on one of the 1944 appropriation bills, in which I find this quotation:

General HERSHEY. I would say the Navy standards, because the Army has gone to the Navy standard. They have gone to it, but if they would change that so that when they make those calls we could take in men below that standard, as soon as they do that we can begin to do business.

The Navy has accepted only about 35 percent of the available inductees. The Army has turned down more than 35 percent because of the Navy standards, which, as I get the figures, have been reduced by the Army by 17 percent. It is my contention that we have not used the available men in IV-F, according to the testimony of General Hershey.

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. The Army is taking in only 5 percent of the IV-F's. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HILL. That is correct as of the present time.

Mr. WHEELER. Up to May 1 they were taking 10 percent, but beginning with May 1 they cut it down to 5 percent. I am not asking these questions to be controversial, but I say that all we have to do is to take the figures which General McNarney himself presented to the committee. If we take those figures, we can show enough men in limited service to make up a sufficient number so it will not be necessary to take fathers.

It should be brought to the attention of the Senate, for I do not think it has been made clear, that 200,000 fathers would be taken into the Army between now and the first of the year. The figure 446,000 has been used, but of that 446,000, 200,000 are to be used by the Army, and the remainder are to be used by the Navy. The Navy not only wants that number of men, but it wants 500,000 after the first of the year, which will bring the number up to nearly a million fathers in the United States who are to be taken into the armed forces, at the very least, if the Navy program is to be carried out.

I also call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Japanese Navy is the only one left to oppose us. The French Navy is out of consideration, having come over to our side, the Italian Navy no longer opposes us, and the Mediterranean has been opened. I do not know how many ships are in the Italian fleet that is being turned over to the United Nations; but the only Navy left is the Japanese Navy.

Mr. HILL. Therein lies the trouble. There is that little "if" about which Mr. Kipling wrote. Think of all the thousands of miles of water between us and Japan.

Mr. WHEELER. But there is the British Navy, and there is the American Navy. We have a larger Navy than has any other country, and we will soon have a larger Navy than the combined navies of the world. In the face of that situation, it is proposed that 750,000 more fathers be taken.

Mr. HILL. The Senator speaks about the Italian Navy. I do not think anyone knows just what that Navy is going to be worth so far as our side is concerned. We are glad, of course, that it is no longer against us, but what it is going to be worth to us I am not sure anyone knows. The Senator and I cannot make the examinations, because, as I stated earlier—and I do not want to go back over it—I have not today any plan in my mind as to how we are to defeat Japan, and I do not suppose the Senator from Montana or any other Senator has any real plan. We do not know what our problem is, we do not know what our job is, we do not know what is to be done not only to win the war, but to win it in the shortest possible time. I cannot overemphasize the importance of winning in the shortest possible time, because every hour, every day, every week, every month the war lasts, costs lives of American boys.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, we know that there is just one way in which to end the war quickly, that is for our ally, Russia, to give us bases in Vladivostok. Army and Navy officers, and everyone else with whom I have talked, concede that the quickest way to win the war, with the least possible loss of life, would be for our great ally, to whom we have sent so much in the way of supplies, to let us use the bases in Vladivostok. We could blow Tokyo and Nagasaki and all the other cities of Japan out of existence. That would be the easiest and the best way to win. I noted that Mr. Browder, the head of the Communist Party, said that, of course, that is not going to happen, that Russia is not going to let us have those bases.

I did not rise for the purpose of bringing up that subject, of course, but to call attention to the fact that, taking into consideration the British Navy, which was supposed to be the greatest navy in the world, the navy on which we were supposed to depend for the protection of the United States, and our own Navy, which today is the largest in the world; taking into consideration the Japanese Navy, as to which we can read reports coming from our Navy Department con-

cerning the number of ships the Japanese have lost and those which have been bombed; and then counting the Italian Navy and the French Navy, which assures that the Allied Nations have a navy superior to anything the Japs have or can possibly have, if we cannot defeat them without taking a million fathers, something is wrong.

Mr. HILL. Yes; we have a Navy which I think is far superior to that of the Japs, but we have a problem entirely different from theirs.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. We are all proud of the fact that we have a three-star Navy which is larger than it has ever been in our history, and larger than any other navy in the world. We are glad the British have a large navy, and we are all glad that the Italian Navy at least has been immobilized for the time being. Certainly the Italian Navy is not going to do anything against us. Those navies are serviceable and useful in the protection of the sea lanes, and the transportation of men and equipment of all sorts, and in fighting against the submarine, and against the Japanese Navy if and when it can be found.

But no matter how large the Navy is, it cannot climb the Alps and get into Germany; it cannot go into Poland, it cannot go into the heart of Japan. It cannot whip the armies of the Axis wherever they may be. So that valuable as the Navy is in protecting our shipments of supplies and equipment, and the transportation of our men, of course no one would contend—the Senator from Montana of course would not—that the Navy can engage in land warfare against the well trained and veteran armies of Germany and Japan which have been fighting for years. Valuable as the navies are in getting us to the places where the fighting is to be, off the water itself these navies cannot do much fighting.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. When I asked Admiral King if the Navy had taken into consideration whether we should continue to build the vessels we have on order—and when I asked Mr. Baruch the same question—the reply was that that had been taken into consideration, and, as I recall, Mr. Baruch said, if not publicly at least privately, that examination was to be made of that phase of the matter, or my recollection is he said it was now being considered.

May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator has said repeatedly, as others who are opposed to my bill have said that we should follow the War Department implicitly with reference to these matters. That is the statement which my distinguished and good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas], and others have made. Let me ask the Senator from Alabama a question. The War Department has urged the passage of a universal service

measure, the so-called Austin-Wadsworth bill, and has stated that its enactment would mitigate the loss of life on the fighting front. That is the statement of the War Department. Does the Senator agree with that statement, or does he favor the passage of the Austin-Wadsworth bill?

Mr. HILL. I have made my position clear, that in this matter I would follow Gen. George C. Marshall and Admiral King, the high command. If the Senator wants my position on the universal service measure, I will say frankly that I think immediately following the impact of Pearl Harbor this country should have passed a universal service act, and if we had then passed such an act totally mobilizing all the manpower and the womanpower of our country, in my opinion, we not only would have been more efficient and been able to carry the war effort forward better than we have, but we would not be plagued by all the headaches we now have.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator now favor the Austin-Wadsworth bill?

Mr. HILL. The Senator has asked me particularly with respect to the Austin-Wadsworth bill. I am not prepared to say that I am in favor of that bill, but I am today in favor of a universal-service act. The fact is, about a year ago I introduced a bill of my own, I will say to the Senator from Montana, to provide for universal service.

The fundamental trouble today is that we have two systems in this country. In the Army we have a system of absolute control. Among the civilians we still have free enterprise. Now we are told, with much acclaim, that we are engaged in a total war, a war not of armies any more but a war of nations. The men who meet the enemy are properly mobilized and are under proper control. The others of us who make up the remainder of the body engaged in waging a total war, as I said earlier—I am not sure the Senator from Montana was present at that time—are still under a free-enterprise system, which means we can do pretty well as we please.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suppose if all were placed under the same system the logical result of the Senator's argument would be that we would have to fix the workmen's wages in accordance with the standard of the men in the armed forces?

Mr. HILL. No; that does not follow at all. In England, in Australia, and in New Zealand that is not true at all. We have legislated on the basis of wages in our price control and ceiling legislation. We have done some things about it.

Mr. TAFT. It still is a different system from that of the military, and inconsistent with the military.

Mr. HILL. It is different from that system, but the fundamental thing is that if all were placed under the same system it would bring every man and every woman under the Government, and every man and woman would have to work or fight or serve in the place

where the particular person could make the greatest contribution to the war effort. I do not care to discuss that subject now. I do not mind at some proper time speaking about universal service. I am in favor of universal service, and I introduced a bill to that effect, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, but I should like to finish my remarks on the bill now before the Senate.

With reference to the subject of limited service, I have before me a memorandum from the War Department which at this point I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate. It is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT GENERAL STAFF,
Washington, October 1, 1943.

Memorandum for the Legislative and Liaison Division:

Based upon an occupational analysis of duties, the maximum number of positions in which limited-service personnel can be used is between 9 and 10 percent of the total strength of the Army as it is geographically distributed at present. With a 7,700,000 Army, this means that there are approximately 700,000 positions in which limited-service personnel may be used.

At the present time we have approximately 562,000 limited-service personnel in the United States and some additional overseas. This figure includes members of the Women's Army Corps.

The difference between these two figures (approximately 140,000) is needed to absorb increases in limited-service personnel obtained (1) from the induction of approximately 9,000 per month; (2) from WAC enlistments; and (3) from general-service men who become limited service as a result of accidents or battle casualties. In addition to this, there will be a decrease in the number of limited-service positions available as the geographical distribution of the Army changes.

R. BERRY,

For M. G. WHITE.

Major General, Assistant Chief of Staff.

Attached to the memorandum is the following statement:

Limited duty personnel may be given the following assignments and those of a similar character:

Prisoner of war escort companies; permanent personnel at post, camp, or station installations, except certain trainer personnel at replacement-training centers or unit-training centers; recruiting and induction stations; reception centers; port battalions; fixed harbor defense and antiaircraft units; aircraft warning companies; special-service personnel; exchange personnel; barrage-balloon units; special units such as bakery companies, decontamination companies, sanitary companies, heavy maintenance companies, engineer regiments' base; station and general hospitals; and appropriate rear echelon detachments or installations of combat divisions, corps, armies, and like large units or organizations normally employed in communication zones or zones of the interior.

Mr. President, in connection with my statement with respect to the Army, at this point in the RECORD I should like to place a statement from the Navy with reference to the use by the Navy of limited-service men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

There will be approximately 1,718,000 men either at sea, assigned to seagoing ships, or on

shore outside the continental limits, on December 31, 1943.

There will be approximately 605,000 men assigned to the shore establishment as of December 31, 1943. These are distributed among:

Bureaus and offices, Navy Department, naval districts; training stations (operating personnel); ammunition depots; air stations; section bases; navy yards and naval operating bases; advance-base depots; receiving ships and stations; hospitals; recruiting and induction stations; harbor entrance control posts; port directors and routing offices; schools (operating personnel).

Approximately 170,000 of these will either be women, or men of substandard physical qualifications. There thus remain approximately 435,000 billets on shore. However, if these billets were to be filled now by men of substandard physical qualifications, there would be no place whatever to usefully employ men who experience has demonstrated must be periodically rehabilitated from sea or advanced theaters. In addition, provision must be made for those who return from combat areas with minor physical disabilities as a result of active combat with the enemy. Personnel in this category often are the most useful of any class to the Navy, and if billets on shore were filled with men of substandard physical qualifications, there would be no place for their employment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the next class of men deferred under the act, who have not been called into the service, are the men deferred under the Tydings amendment, those who are engaged in agriculture. Today, there are some 1,715,000 men, some single men, some married men, and some fathers, who are deferred under the Tydings amendment. Those men will continue under that amendment to be deferred so long as they meet the terms and conditions laid down in the Tydings amendment. Senators will recall that we prescribed in that amendment that a person had to be engaged in essential agricultural production, production essential to the war effort, and he also must be irreplaceable, that is, there was no other man who could be placed in his position to carry on the work of production in which he was engaged. Those men will continue, of course, to be deferred just as they have been deferred in the past.

The next group is what we call class III-D. The men in that group are registrants whose induction would cause undue hardship and privation to their dependents. There are 102,000 men in that group.

The next group is made up of certain officials of State, county, and city governments. There are 6,000 men in that group.

The next group is made up of neutral aliens requesting relief from training and service, and aliens not acceptable to the armed forces. There are 48,000 men in that group.

The next group is made up of ministers of religion and divinity students. There are 120,000 men in that group.

The next group is made up of men who are conscientious objectors. Some 10,000 men are in that group.

When one considers that list among the 22,000,000 registrants, he finds it is inevitable that it will be necessary to draft some fathers. However much one might deplore it or however much one

might wish to avoid it, examination of the list I have sought to give to the Senate in detail shows how inevitable and unavoidable is the drafting of fathers.

Mr. President, what I have said about physically unfit men applies in part to men over age 38. In that connection, I should like to have printed at this point in the RECORD, General Marshall's testimony about men over age 38. I shall not go into that matter; I simply desire to have his statement printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General MARSHALL. As to men over 38, I have already expressed myself in considerable detail. They would be, to my mind, a burden rather than a help, because the number that prove ineffective for our purpose is so large, and the conditions under which we must accept them under the policies of Congress as to hospitalization, etc., immediately imposes on us a very heavy burden. I mean by this that a man may never have been in a hospital in his life in his ordinary civil occupation, but when he comes into the Army he gets a certain right and he takes advantage of it. We have him immediately on our hands, and he is operated on for this, operated on for that, and we must do it. So that the men over 38 I would regard as a burden.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, today there are about one and one-half million married men in the Army. Some 800,000 fathers are in the armed forces of our country.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest two things about the point he has raised?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, a very considerable number of the fathers are men who volunteered for service.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The fact that they volunteered indicates that they were able to make some arrangement about their businesses or their families. A very large number of the fathers are men who became such subsequent to Pearl Harbor. Of course, they knew exactly the condition they were creating, and they did not get married and have children unless they knew there was a method of taking care of their wives and children.

So I do not think the fact that there are one and one-half million fathers in the Army today has any very great bearing on the present question of the drafting by force of fathers.

Mr. HILL. I did not say there were one and one-half million fathers in the Army. I said there were one and one-half million married men, and some 800,000 fathers. I concede that the fact is that because there are some 800,000 fathers in the Army it does not necessarily follow that other fathers should be drafted; but, I think the Senate should know that today there are 800,000 fathers in our armed forces, and many of them are at the battle fronts. In the consideration of this matter, and of what

so often has been described as the American home, we must consider the homes of the 800,000 fathers who now are in the armed services, many of whom, as I have said, are at the battle fronts.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I wonder if the Senator would relate the presence in the Army of those 800,000 fathers to the very, very bad condition in the matter of child control at the present time. It is a notorious fact that today in this country 13-year-old and 14-year-old girls—

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator refer to the matter of delinquency?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly.

Mr. HILL. I will say to my distinguished friend that the question is a very apt one, but I have not investigated that matter. However, I have the thought—I give it to the Senator only as a thought—that the delinquency about which we hear so much, and which no doubt does exist, exists more among the children of persons who are engaged in industry and in other civilian occupations, rather than among the children of fathers who are in the armed services.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would say to the Senator that possibly the absence of a father leads to a weakening of the control of the family and leads to the existence of conditions about which all of us hear, when 13-year-old and 14-year-old girls are chasing soldiers, and all that sort of thing, and that related to that is the matter of the employment in industry of the wives of those fathers, with the consequent disruption of family control.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator that undoubtedly one of our problems today is that of juvenile delinquency. However, during the last war, as I recall, while there was a great wave of juvenile delinquency it never was necessary to draft fathers, and fathers never were drafted. We never did reach the point where it became necessary to draft fathers. By the time we nearly reached the point of drafting fathers, the Germans signed the armistice, and the war was over, and we did not have to draft fathers.

I think there are many factors, in addition to the fact that the fathers are absent, which contribute to delinquency. There are many other things about war which breed delinquency. To start with, war per se does not appeal to the higher or the finer or the better instincts of human nature. To be filled with the idea of destroying something or killing one's fellow men is not conducive to what might be called a healthy or wholesome atmosphere for either children or adults.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the distinguished Senator that to the extent that the father, the head of a family, does exercise family control—and in most instances I think he does exercise some control—

Mr. HILL. At least, the Senator and I like to believe he does.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; in most cases I think he does—at least to that extent, we are releasing that much control over the discipline of families at home, when we draft fathers.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask whether any Senator is able to determine the proportion of responsibility for any existing juvenile delinquency above that which is normal which is attributable to the absence of fathers, particularly the fathers of young girls. I refer particularly to the delinquency among young girls which was referred to by the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], with especial reference to their location about Army camps, and one thing and another. Is any Senator able to furnish any statistics to show to what extent young girls may be delinquent because of the absence of the stabilizing influence of an older unmarried brother who is in the Army? It is difficult to assign to any family group of any status total responsibility for delinquency. If the facts showed that no one had been delinquent except the children of the 700,000 or 800,000 married men with children who are in the Army, there might be some support for the statement which has been made. However, in my opinion there are no such statistics.

As the Senator from Alabama said, war breeds a lowering of morale, and leads to a breaking down of the instinct to follow the straight and narrow path.

I doubt if anyone could furnish the information, unless it was based on a house-to-house canvass all over the United States, of the extent to which the delinquency of children is attributable to the absence of fathers, or even the absence of brothers who usually have a stabilizing effect on their sisters, as well as on their own brothers. I do not think it is possible to say that all the delinquency which now exists is attributable to the absence of the 800,000 fathers who are in the armed services; because in order to prove that it would be necessary to make a census to determine how many of such fathers have delinquent children.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I did not assert that.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but all during the debate it has been emphasized that the delinquency now suffered is due to the presence in the Army of some seven hundred or eight hundred thousand fathers.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will concede that in some cases family discipline is probably improved by the absence of the father.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be true. I do not like to think that that is the rule.

Mr. MILLIKIN. As a rule, I believe that family discipline is definitely impaired by the absence of fathers.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that it is more usually claimed that delinquency is due to the absence of the mother working in a war plant. Of course, the

moment the husband is drafted, the wife is practically forced to go to work in a war plant. So the indirect effect is probably even greater than that of the absence of the father. As to the 800,000 fathers, as I pointed out to the Senator, it seems to me that they are in a class apart. They are men who volunteered, or who were found by draft boards not to have any serious family situation, in nearly every case. I doubt if any of those men left families without having previously made provision by which the wife and children may be taken care of by other members of the family or by independent means.

Mr. BARKLEY. That raises the question as to how many of the wives of the 800,000 fathers are in war work or in war plants. I do not know. My judgment is that the proportion is small. As the Senator from Ohio says, those men largely volunteered, or were found to have a family status which did not justify their deferment, and therefore that did not create any delinquency problem. I doubt if one could prove anything on the subject of delinquency by taking the 800,000 fathers as an example, or as a basis for calculations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator might be interested in the report of the Committee on Health and Welfare of the Welfare Division of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, in which this statement is made—

Mr. HILL. From whom is the Senator quoting?

Mr. TAFT. This is a report by the Committee on Health and Welfare of the Welfare Division of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, which is an association of all the charitable institutions and others dealing with this problem. The committee makes this statement, which I think sums up the general situation:

War has a devastating effect on practically every individual and family, even without the removal of the bread-winner, husband, and father. With this additional loss, the supervision, training, and, hence, the stability of children are threatened in practically every instance. England has gone so far as to recall many men from the front in order to make more male leadership available for children and young people in schools, clubs, churches, and homes.

I think that is a fair summary of the situation. No one can exactly evaluate it. This committee consists of experts on the subject. They have been studying the problem of juvenile delinquency in Cleveland, and I think their conclusion can be said to be a reasonable one.

Mr. HILL. So many factors enter into the question of juvenile delinquency that one would have to go into it and study it rather carefully, and then I am not sure that he would be able to evaluate the many factors which enter into it.

While we are speaking of fathers and children, I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that when the Senate adopted the Tydings amendment deferring men because of agricultural occupations, it recognized that the national interest transcended the question of

fathers or of delinquency. Under that amendment we not only provided that if a man were engaged in essential agriculture and could not be replaced, he should be deferred, but we went a step further and provided that if he were engaged in agriculture essential to the war effort, and left his occupation, he would be drafted, irrespective of dependency, children, or anything else.

The plans and the grand strategy of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, to whom we commonly refer as the high command, have not been guessed at, or arrived at in a haphazard manner. Those plans were studied for months by the Joint Staff Planning Committee.

In part 24 of the hearings on manpower before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs will be found a report on those plans, and the story of the committee and its work. That committee did not confine itself to military or naval testimony. It consulted with and sought the advice of economists, industrial engineers, agricultural experts, and experts of all kinds, having in mind that it had to consider what the enemy could do, what his power was, what his problems were, and the fact that we have to win the war in the shortest possible time, and with the smallest expenditure of life.

That committee had to consider that we here at home had three fundamental obligations to meet: First, the raising, equipping, maintenance, and transportation of our armed forces; second, meeting our obligations under the Lend-Lease Act; and, third, the maintenance of our civilian economy.

Predicated on those three obligations, and predicated on the enemy, his power, condition, and problems, these plans were carefully thought through and worked out. Certainly nothing was done in the framing of the plans which would in any way justify us, or any other civilian body, in now saying to our high commanders, "Your plans were not properly predicated. They were not properly worked out. You did not give consideration to many factors which you should have considered."

On the contrary, all the evidence clearly shows that the many factors which should have been considered were brought into consideration. As I stated earlier in the day, many of the factors which the high command considered, and which it should have considered, are not available to us for consideration. No person, even admitting that he had military experience, background, and knowledge, or even admitting that he had military genius, could possibly work out such plans unless he also had knowledge of all the factors which should enter into the plans, and unless he not only knew all the facts about our own armed forces, our lend-lease obligations, and our civilian economy, but also knew what our allies had, what they could do, what their problems were, how much we could depend on them, and how much help we might get from them, as well as how much help we had to give them, and how much they were depending upon us. To know that, we would have to know exactly, as the Joint Chiefs of Staff must

know, what the situation in China is, what the situation in Russia is, and what the situation in Britain is, with respect to the British Army, the British Navy, and the British civilian front. We would have to know the situation of all our allies. We do not have such information.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I admit that we have to go a long way in accepting the recommendations of the joint chiefs of staff. Will not the Senator agree with me that it is contrary to our duty to accept automatically the recommendations of the military, that the military are not in the best position to preserve the balance between the civil power and the military power?

I would remind the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama that one of the assigned reasons for our separation from Great Britain was the allegation that the King had affected to render the military power independent of, and superior to, the civil power. For that reason, and because of all prior history on military tyranny, the Constitution puts in Congress the power to declare war, and the power to raise and to maintain the Army and Navy. We cannot escape our responsibility.

Mr. HILL. Not the power to fight that Army.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The power to raise and maintain the Army. We have the power to raise and maintain the Army. The argument goes directly to the raising and the maintaining of the Army. For that reason, I cannot go along with the theory that we must automatically accept the recommendations of the military, no matter how highly we may esteem them.

Mr. HILL. Of course, we should not automatically accept, and would not be justified in automatically accepting, the recommendations of the military. Certainly, in normal times, and, insofar as we can in wartimes, we should know exactly what the military are doing; and insofar as we can, we should check the military. I agree thoroughly with the Senator on that proposition.

However, in the light of the situation we confront today, in which we find ourselves involved in a great global war, fighting for the very life of our Nation, the very salvation of our freedom and our institutions, I say that in many of these matters, so far as military strategy and military plans are concerned, we must put our faith and our confidence in our military commanders, and must support them and back them up.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I repeat to the Senator from Alabama that we should go a long way on that, but we should not accept all recommendations automatically. So far as I am concerned, if it is suggested by the military that out of several million deferments for health reasons, illiteracy reasons, and essential-industry reasons, we cannot recomb the lists and obtain 450,000 men who are not fathers, then I cannot accept that military judg-

ment. Therefore, I favor the Wheeler bill as amended by the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. HILL. I say to the Senator that not only did General Marshall and Admiral King, as well as others in the Army and Navy, give us the information they thought they could, before the committee, but, as the Senator knows—because I was interested to note that he was present at many of the meetings—frequently they gave us information which was off the record, information which could not go into the record.

I believe they sought to give us all the information they possibly could or that they felt they would be justified in giving without at the same time endangering the lives of American boys who now are in battle or in combat in the theaters of operations. I am very sorry the Senator does not have the same faith and confidence in General Marshall that I have in this matter. I have great faith in him, and I think he justifies that faith in a matter of this kind, when we are today in the midst of battle and when at this hour American boys are fighting and dying. We must sustain and support our military commanders.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me say to the Senator that I share his faith in General Marshall. As a junior officer in the last war, I observed at rather close range the greatness of General Marshall. General Marshall is a great general and a great salesman. He can charm a bird off a tree. I would say that if General Marshall were not elbowing in and pushing and grabbing for everything he can get for his military forces, I would think him an incompetent; and he is not incompetent. I suggest it is his duty to get everything he can get in the way of manpower for his armies. At the same time, it is our duty to preserve the balance between civilian duties and military power.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I cannot agree with the Senator's estimate of General Marshall when he says the general is shoving and grabbing in order to get all he can get for his Army. No doubt the General could have had 563,000 more men for his Army, because Congress agreed, and had appropriated the money to enable him to have 563,000 additional men. However, he is so conscientious, and is so much a statesman as well as a soldier, that he voluntarily came to Congress and said, in effect, "I have been able to retrench in such a way, due to a difference in the strategic situation, and due to economies I have been able to put into practice in the Army, that I shall not ask for these 563,000 men."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thought that action on the part of General Marshall was quite commendable.

Mr. HILL. It was quite commendable, and it shows an attitude and a spirit of purpose contrary to any attitude or purpose to try to scrouge in and get all he can. I think General Marshall is imbued with one great thought, and that is to win the war in the shortest possible time, and save the life of every mother's son he can, and he has based his plans and his strategy on that one thought.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not take any action at this time to reduce the overall size of the Army. I would not, however, object to some little delay and to training-camp dislocation in order to see if we cannot get the 450,000 men from those who are not fathers.

In the testimony of General Marshall I noticed with special interest that he said there would be dislocations if the men did not come into the Army according to present plans. I would remind the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama of a fact he well knows: The art of war is largely an art of overcoming dislocations. From the moment a force lands on a beach, dislocations commence. Every time a front is widened or narrowed, every time the depth of an organization is increased or decreased, every time a unit is attached to any given organization, every time a unit is detached from any given organization, there are dislocations. I believe that a reasonable amount of training-camp dislocation provides excellent staff training for the officers of our Army. During the next few months the flow of manpower might not be quite as smooth as we should like to see it; but if in the end we obtained the ultimate manpower which is needed, I believe the resourcefulness and intelligence of our great Army staff is equal to the task of overcoming those dislocations.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I recognize that what the Senator says is true, that in time of war there are many dislocations. However, I do not want any more dislocations than are absolutely necessary, because when we have dislocations we pay a terrible price for them; we are likely to pay in human life, in human body and in human blood.

In time of war we can permit dislocations in anything but in our armed forces. Dislocations in other matters might cost us some money or might cost us some discomfort or might cost us some delay, but I cannot join in the thought the Senator has expressed concerning dislocations. We want the minimum number of dislocations we can possibly have. We want to prevent every dislocation it is possible to prevent, because, as I have said, when we have dislocation we pay such a terrible price for it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It seems to me that would involve the question of balance between the dislocations which could not be overcome by the Army and the dislocations which could not be overcome at home.

Mr. HILL. Yes. I think no man has shown greater ability in overcoming dislocations than has General Marshall. As I have said, he showed that when he voluntarily changed his plans without any suggestion by Congress and reduced the number of the Army by some 560,000 men.

Mr. President, while we are speaking of General Marshall and Admiral King and other officers of the high command, I recall that Mr. Gladstone said on one occasion that the good fortune of America lay in the fact that always, in the hour of her need, God Almighty raised

up a man to lead and guide her. If any people have ever been fortunate in their commanders the American people have been fortunate in having General Marshall and Admiral King. They were particularly fortunate when this terrible war came upon us that General Marshall was at the time and had been for some months previously the Chief of Staff of our Army. The record of these commanders is a brilliant one. Considering the problems that have confronted them and considering the stupendous job they have had to do, I might say that they have almost achieved the impossible.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will let me finish my speech, I will appreciate it, but I do not want to be discourteous to him. Does he desire to say something on a subject not related to the commanders of our forces?

Mr. TAFT. No, I merely wish to comment on the statement as to General Marshall's magnanimity in reducing the size of the Army.

Mr. HILL. I did not say it was magnanimity; I said it was soldier statesmanship.

Mr. TAFT. The point I want to suggest is that he asked for an army of 8,200,000 men, and if we had acted on that 6 months ago and said, "No, seven million six or seven hundred thousand men is sufficient," the Senator from Alabama would have stood up and denounced us—

Mr. HILL. I certainly would not, because conditions themselves are different from what they were then. At that time we had not conquered north Africa, and had not effectuated certain economies in our Army.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Alabama would have denounced us and said we were causing the deaths of more boys at the front. Yet it would have turned out that we would have been right.

Mr. HILL. In the light of conditions then existing you would have been wholly wrong.

Mr. TAFT. I absolutely deny—

Mr. HILL. Conditions changed.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think there has been any change in conditions that caused this reduction in the Army. They simply found they could not handle a larger Army than 7,700,000.

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator aware of the conquest of north Africa?

Mr. TAFT. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator know that the figures 8,200,000 were arrived at many months—I think over a year—before the conquest of north Africa? Has the Senator stopped to realize what that conquest has meant so far as this war is concerned and so far as we are concerned? If the Senator would turn his thinking a little bit more to what we have done and what we are going to do than why we should not do these things he might see more of the picture.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see that anything that has happened has furnished any reason for a reduction of the number of men in the Army. There are just as many men needed in Italy as ever were

needed in north Africa. I may state to the Senator that I think General Marshall's reduction of the figures was eminently praiseworthy. I only wanted to say that it only shows that General Marshall may have been right or he may have overestimated the number; but I deny that his opinion is infallible, and it seems to me very clear that he has modified the Army estimates, although Assistant Secretary Patterson, Secretary Knox, and other high officials are pointing out that we have even a greater task now before us than before the invasion of Italy. We have made an invasion of Italy from the south. That task is only begun, and certainly this is no time to reduce the Army. The fact is we never did require an army of 8,200,000 men; there is no evidence that we ever required such a number.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio says the task has only begun. He is entirely wrong. The task has multiplied, however, since the infamous attack at Pearl Harbor. The major doing of the task has only begun. There is a difference between a task and the major doing of the task. We have now arrived at the point where we can go forward with the major doing of the task. It took many months to prepare to do this task. I shall not take the time to reiterate what I said about how the north African conquest changed our situation, and how the economies effectuated in the Army changed our situation; but the situation today is entirely different from what it was many months ago when the figures 8,200,000 were arrived at. If the Senator cannot see that the north African campaign has changed our situation, there is nothing I could say that would give him the picture.

Mr. President, since the Senator speaks about that campaign, let me call the attention of the Senate to what has happened. I will not go all the way back to early 1942 when, as I recall, the plans were agreed upon and the size of the Army at 8,200,000 men was arrived at. Let us go back to a year from today, and see how the situation has changed. One year ago today the British Eighth Army were standing with their backs to the gates of Alexandria; Rommel, with his Afrika Korps, was knocking at the gates of Alexandria; and it looked as if Rommel and his Afrika Korps would smash those gates and through the British Eighth Army, drive on through Egypt, take the Suez Canal, and enable the Germans and the Japanese to join hands. Had they joined hands instead of our being on the interior lines we would have had a ring of steel around us and we would be on the outside, with China completely knocked out of the war, with India knocked out of the war, and with practically no access to Russia from then on.

One year ago the epic siege of Stalingrad had just begun, and no one knew but that Stalingrad would remain in the hands of the Nazis. The Germans were driving south toward the great oil fields of the Middle East, and if they had been successful 1 year ago in that drive to the oil fields of the Middle East, every drop

of petroleum for every plane and every tank and every other gasoline machine possessed by any of the United Nations, from China to the United States, would have to come from one of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. Just a year ago we were confronted with that situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will permit me to finish, then, I will yield. I do not want to be discourteous to the Senator; I merely desire to finish my remarks.

Mr. TAFT. All I wanted to suggest was that if all these dreadful things had happened, we could not have used an Army of 8,200,000 under any circumstances, because we could not have transported them to Europe in the way and in the numbers in which we are now able to transport them.

Mr. HILL. I do not agree with the Senator as to that. One year ago, Mr. President, America's might was still being mobilized; we were still in the process of training and mobilizing our might. We were yet to make an appearance in force on Europe's battle fields. One year ago Japan was on the offensive everywhere, and particularly in New Guinea, where Japanese troops were moving down the southern slopes of the Owen Stanley Mountains, threatening the United Nations, great base at Port Moresby, and threatening to make a drive on Australia.

Today, under the brilliant command of Gen. George C. Marshall and Admiral Ernest King, what is the situation? The Russians, as we know, hold Stalingrad; the Russians stopped the Germans long before they got to the precious oil fields in the Middle East, and in more recent months, they have been driving the Germans back until they recaptured all the territory in which are located the cities of Orel, Kharkov, and Rostov. They have even recently retaken the city of Smolensk, and now they threaten the ancient city of Kiev. They have been driving the Germans back, back, back, until they have now driven them to the Dnieper River.

In the Far East we know of the victories which have been won in the Solomon Islands, at Munda, Lae, Salamaua. Do those names mean nothing to us? We have been squeezing the Japanese out of the jungles of New Guinea, driving them, destroying Japanese ship after Japanese ship and Japanese plane after Japanese plane, taking our objectives, and winning victory after victory.

We have only recently established a command in India under Lord Mountbatten, and are now making a drive out of India soon to go on through Burma and reopen the Burma Road, so that we may get supplies to our Chinese allies.

In Europe, Italy has been completely knocked out of the war. Her men, her armies, her fleet, her ships, her guns, all her war effort, are out. No longer confronted are we with Italy and her armies and her fleet. We have taken the southern portion of Italy; we are now moving in on the central portion, and judging from recent dispatches, it will not be long before we will be the masters of all

central Italy. The whole German position in the Balkans has been outflanked by our conquest of Italy, and the Adriatic has changed from an Axis lake to a United Nations lake.

We have driven the Nazis out of Sardinia and Corsica, and have now taken those two bases in the Mediterranean. We have seized other bases in the Mediterranean, in the Aegean Sea, in the Adriatic, and in the other seas pouring into the Mediterranean. The Mediterranean is now our sea, our lake.

The Germans will shoulder greater burdens in the Balkans. We know that a large proportion of the soldiers of occupation in the Balkans were Italian soldiers. Those soldiers are now out of the war, so their places must now be filled by German soldiers. We also know that when the Italians laid down their arms, some of those arms, at least, fell into the hands of little guerilla bands in the Balkans, and the Germans will now not only not have these Italian arms fighting with them and for them, but those arms will be in the hands of men in the Balkans who will be waging warfare against Germany.

We know that in northern Italy, Germany today has her forces and services of supply, such as transportation, which were formerly carried on and manned and maintained by Italians, which will constitute an additional burden for the Germans, because they will have to operate the railroads and carry on the lines of supply and do many things which Italians were doing.

Mr. President, the situation has changed entirely since last year. A year ago we were on the defensive practically everywhere. Today, we have seized the greatest factor in military success, we have seized the great factor of offensive, and today, practically everywhere, we are on the offensive.

General Marshall has said that the pattern for victory is now clear. All we have to do, whatever the costs may be, whatever the sacrifices may be, is to drive forward according to this pattern, and we know that victory for us in the war will be inevitable.

Now, Mr. President, the Senate is confronted with a momentous decision, as to whether or not it will take such action as will change or endanger this pattern for victory, whether or not it will change or force a change in the grand strategy and the grand plans of our high commanders, which have proven so successful up to date, which have brought us great victories, which have put us on the offensive everywhere and whether or not it will make a decision which will set up our judgment over the judgment of these brilliantly successful military and naval commanders. Our military and naval commanders tell us that if we set our judgment up against theirs, if we force them to make changes in the plans and in the strategy, and take our judgment rather than theirs, the war inevitably will be lengthened; and when we lengthen the war, we increase the danger of every American boy who goes out to the battle front. Every boy on a warship, every boy flying an airplane,

every boy in the ground troops, will find the danger which threatens him increased if we lengthen the war. He has so many chances of life within a given period. If we extend the war, we lessen his chances for life, we lessen his chances to come back whole of body and of mind.

Mr. President, for us to change the plans of our commanders, for us to refuse to sustain and to support our commanders, is for us to gamble with the lives of our boys and with the safety of our country, and greatly increase the burden upon the American people. Every day the war lasts the heart-breaking financial burden increases. Every citizen of this land has his burden increased every hour of every day the war lasts. There will be more mothers without sons, there will be more wives without husbands, there will be more children without fathers, there will be more of the citizens of this country gone, for every day the war continues. There will be the huge debt piling day by day and week by week upon the backs of the American people. There will be the greater and greater depreciation each day of our critical and strategic materials, all the materials which are so precious to our civilization, to the economy of our Nation, and to the future of our country.

Mr. President, knowing the record of our military commanders, knowing how they have been tried in the balance and found not wanting, how they have done things which many military men counted impossible of accomplishment, knowing their brilliant achievements and the victories we have won, I shall keep my faith and my confidence in them, I shall continue to support and sustain them, and I shall refuse to gamble with the lives of American boys and the safety of our country.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Chief of Staff expressing the attitude of the War Department on the proposed amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the pending bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, October 4, 1943.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The Secretary of War has referred to me your request for my views on the proposed amendment of Senator TAIT to the pending bill, S. 763, providing for the deferment of certain married men with children depending upon age. I am advised by Selective Service that the effect of Senator TAIT's amendment would be that the armed forces would receive only men attaining the age of 18 and over the age of 30 after about February 1, 1944.

From a military standpoint the induction of men within age groups in a predetermined order, namely, those under 25, next those between 25 and 30, and then from 30 to 38, is unsound. Men being taken at this time and in the future for military service are for use from 4 to 16 months hence depending upon the type of training required. While the Army is now approaching its ultimate

strength, a number of units must be filled during the remainder of this year. Most of these are service elements in which older men can best be used. Next year the bulk of men will, in all probability, be required for replacements to combat troops, and they should represent the younger and most vigorous types.

If Selective Service is required to furnish the Army only those men under 30 years of age during the remainder of this year, and those over 30 next year, it would appear that the younger men must, of necessity, be placed in service units in order that those units will be ready when required. The older men will then be received in large concentrations and must therefore be trained as battle replacements. Such an arrangement appears unsound and not in the best military interest, since the only pool from which battle casualty replacements could be secured, if Senator TAIT's proposed amendment is enacted into law, would be from that category of men older than 30 years, and those later becoming 18. Also, it would appear unfair to the older men and to the service to so time their induction as to force the majority into combat units as loss replacements.

The Army must meet its personnel requirements on schedule, and this cannot be done if the Army is required to reshuffle and retrain personnel because it has not received a fair and average cross section of age and physical condition.

The training of the men has been planned upon a basis of receiving such a cross section. My sole concern is the procurement of men with proper qualifications in the required numbers and at the necessary times. Legislation which would compel the induction of men by age groups or upon other artificial standards would threaten the orderly flow of the Nation's military manpower in the armed forces and, I believe, would hinder its efficient utilization.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the greatest wastrels in the most wasteful nation of all history are the military overlords of the Army and the Navy. They are wasting the natural resources of this Nation in a scandalous manner; they are wasting the funds and throwing this Nation into hopeless bankruptcy at a pace that does shame to the profligate of all ages; and they are wasting the manpower of this Nation with utter disregard for civilian welfare and for our assumption of being the arsenal of democracy and our ambition to be the world's granary.

They have been hoarding huge supplies of lumber and small hardware of every description, with no use in sight, while the civilian goes without. They deliberately burned millions of feet of scrap lumber that civilians would have been glad to pay for. They caused wild and devastating inflation by paying unheard-of wages in the construction of Army and Navy camps.

More goes out the back door of America's Army camps than goes in the front door of any other army in the world.

That is not my statement. It is the statement of a man who purchases and salvages grease from Army kitchens.

Why does Congress permit such waste? The answer is very simple. The Army and the Navy have the Congress and the people over a barrel. They have our sons and the sons of the American

people on all the battle fronts of the world. If we deny them anything, if we curtail their extravagance in any respect, we are faced with the assertion by them that we are cutting off the supply of food, clothing, and weapons of our loved ones at the front, and are speculating with their lives.

I have sense enough to know that the Army and the Navy cannot spend \$100,000,000 in 12 months efficiently and effectively. It is my honest opinion that military appropriations could be cut 50 percent without injury to the war effort. And yet, this summer I voted for the hundred-billion-dollar military appropriations, because I will not take a chance on the life, well-being, or comfort of a single American boy. I am sure that many of my colleagues faced the same impossible dilemma and reached the same conclusion I have reached.

Last summer I spoke to many audiences of Navy mothers and Army mothers. I had hundreds of private conferences with them. I would prefer the guillotine to failure to support fully their flesh and blood on the field of battle. Yes; the military overlords of the Army and the Navy have the Congress and the country over a barrel, and they are making the most of it. It is their day to howl, and they are taking full advantage.

On September 1 of this year they had an Army, according to General Marshall, of 7,300,000 persons. This did not include the personnel of the Navy, Marines, or Coast Guard. It is conceded that by January 1, 1944, not more than 2,700,000 of these men can be transported to the various battle fronts, supplied and equipped; and yet our military overlords insist that they must bring the Army to a strength of 7,700,000 by January 1, 1944, with an excess of 5,000,000 men to be left in the United States. Furthermore, during the entire 12 months of 1944 only an additional 2,300,000 will be transported to the combat areas, which still will leave 2,700,000 men in the United States if not another man is inducted during the next calendar year other than the 18-year-olds to care for all necessary replacements.

On the cold mathematics of the thing, it is my conclusion that the Army and Navy do not have immediate need for the 1,221,000 men which they are going to induct during the next 3 months; but, as I say, the military overlords are in the saddle, with American soldiers all over the world and, in keeping with the admonition of Bernard Baruch, I for one am not going to do any "cheese paring" or "trading down." Even though in my opinion they cannot use 1,221,000 additional men during the next 3 months to good military advantage, I am not going to try to impose my will on them.

Congress has given them every dollar, every natural resource, every law, and every man they have asked for since that fatal 3d day of September 1939, and we will continue to give them everything without stint until this awful thing is over.

However, that is not the issue in the pending measure. The Senator from

Montana [Mr. WHEELER] does not propose to deny General Marshall or Admiral King one solitary man or woman. He is perfectly willing that they should have the full 1,221,000 additional inductees which they have requested. The question, and the only question involved, is whether this 1,221,000 shall contain 446,000 pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. In spite of all the shouting that is the only issue.

General Marshall and Admiral King are not involved in it in any way. Both have testified that they are not requesting 446,000 fathers but that they are requesting 1,221,000 men and women for the armed forces between October 1 and December 31 of this year.

Senators who thump their chests and wrap themselves in the flag and shout eternal support for General Marshall are evading the issue. It is not Chief of Staff General Marshall whom they are supporting; it is the War Manpower Commission. They are shouting their approval of General Marshall, but it is the Manpower Commission they are approving.

Those of us who are supporting the Wheeler bill and the various amendments and substitutes for it believe that the Selective Service can find the 1,221,000 men without touching a single one of the 446,000 pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. That is all there is to this whole issue. We believe Selective Service should make an honest effort to get sufficient men without taking pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. We think they are taking the easy way out. It is easier to take fathers than it is to scrape the bottom of the barrel for single men.

POST-WAR COLLABORATION—THE FULBRIGHT RESOLUTION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in today's newspapers appears a poll taken by the Associated Press of the United States Senate on what is called the Fulbright resolution. In that so-called poll by the Associated Press it is said that some 42 Senators are supporting the Fulbright resolution, and 11 are against it, and 43 not committed.

Mr. President, it is not my habit to discuss newspaper articles or newspaper polls. I would not do so today except for the fact that I am fearful that not so much the contents of the news article as the headlines which have been given to it might create a wrong impression, not only in the Senate, and perhaps in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but also throughout the country. For instance, the headline in the newspaper which I have before me at this moment reads:

Fulbright resolution backed by 42 Senators.

That is a substantial number of Senators. Inasmuch as my own name appears among those who are backing this resolution, and also the name of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]—the Senators who introduced the Senate resolution—it might be thought that we had abandoned our particular resolution, or the purposes and objectives which we

had in mind, and that we are now supporting the Fulbright resolution.

Mr. President, I think I am correctly quoted in the article. It is said in the article:

The general attitude is summed up by Senator HATCH, of New Mexico, with this comment, "If that is all we can get I am for it, but it is not strong enough."

Mr. President, I am quite certain I made that statement, and upon that statement I was included among those listed as being in favor of the Fulbright resolution. But I wish to make it clear here today that I am not supporting the Fulbright resolution. I am not backing the Fulbright resolution. While I did say that I might vote for it if I could not get something better, I am not so sure today that I would vote for it at all.

I do not want to enter into a discussion now of the details of that resolution, but I do want to say that my whole thought about the rights of this body to make a declaration at all is based on the Constitution of the United States, section 2, article II, which reads in part, referring to the President—

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties.

The word "advice" to me has seemed to be a word which was used by the framers of the Constitution with deliberation, meaning that the Senate, not the House of Representatives, not the Mackinac convention or any other body—the Senate of the United States was charged with the duty and responsibility of giving advice to the executive branch of government.

I have thought in that connection that if that should be our responsibility, the advice should be given in advance, and I believe, Mr. President, if advice is to be of any use whatsoever it should be advice which means something. It should not be a mere play on words and phrases which could be susceptible of any interpretation or of any meaning, and I speak now directly of the Fulbright resolution, with all due respect to its author and to those who voted for it, having the best motives and purposes in mind.

The reason I say today that I am not supporting and not backing that resolution is because it is susceptible of practically every interpretation under the sun. On the one hand, those who oppose any collaboration can safely vote for such a resolution and say it means nothing. On the other hand, those who would go to the extreme view may say, "We can do everything we want to within the terms of this resolution."

I think, Mr. President, if the Senate of the United States exercises its constitutional power its action ought to be to set forth in language plain enough and definite enough so that it would amount to advice within the intent and meaning of the Constitution.

Mr. BALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I merely wish to associate myself with the remarks made a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] regarding the Fulbright resolution and the poll which

appeared in this morning's newspapers. I cannot escape the conclusion that at the forthcoming conference between Britain, Russia, and the United States, the question of the arrangements to maintain peace and stability in the European theater must be discussed.

All of us hope that the war in that theater will be over in the next year. I myself cannot see how the influence of the United States can have the weight it should have in that conference unless the United States Senate speaks clearly and specifically as to the policies and programs which it is prepared to set forth at this time to maintain peace after we shall have won the war.

The American representatives in that conference now can say what they think the United States will do, but our allies know very well that what they propose must eventually come to the Senate to be approved. Our representatives will speak with much greater authority, and our influence will be much greater in setting the pattern of the peace after this war, if the Senate speaks clearly and specifically as to the policies or programs which it believes will best safeguard the peace after we shall have won the war.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. On that point, I do not want it to be inferred from the remarks which I made that I thought there was anything improper in the Republican Party adopting a plank, or any other organization passing a resolution, as to policy. I was trying to point out that there is an entirely different obligation on the Senate than on the other organizations, which are not charged with responsibility.

Mr. BALL. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico.

SHORTAGE OF CARS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF CROPS

Mr. LANGER. Earlier today, Mr. President, I brought to the attention of the Senate a telegram sent to me by the North Dakota Public Service Commission, also signed by the commissioner of agriculture and labor and by the attorney general of the State, dealing with the boxcar situation.

Most Senators know that the records of the Department of Agriculture show that North Dakota this year has raised more wheat than any other State in the Union. It has surpassed even the great State of Kansas, which has held the record for some time.

Mr. President, the telegram says that the farmers of North Dakota—and I might say the same situation prevails in the State of Montana—will lose millions of bushels through deterioration of the wheat. It is piled up with the rain coming down upon it, and within a few days snow will be coming down upon it. Roughly 40 percent of our wheat is still in shocks. The telegram says that over 1,100 of our elevators are blocked at this time because we cannot obtain cars. Yet the telegram says that our railroads are arranging to import 18,000,000 bushels of

feed wheat to the United States from Canada.

Mr. President, I submit that our railroads ought to take care of our farmers first before they take care of those of Canada or any other country. Our farmers in North Dakota are now working with old machinery. They could not obtain repairs. Thousands of the farmers there sent their wives and little children out into the fields to plant the crops and to harvest them, and now when they have the crops they cannot even get the railroads to haul the crops, and the excuse is that they cannot obtain boxcars.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article which, as I said earlier today, appeared in the Washington Evening Star of October 1, which sets out that an attorney named Melvin D. Hildreth, of Washington, D. C., has advertised for sale 60 boxcars, and that the Government will not buy them. These 60 boxcars, according to this article—

were built to order for an ordnance plant, but reverted to the Warren Car Co. when work at the plant was discontinued after the cars had hauled munitions only a few weeks.

They are only 36 feet long—4 feet less than standard—

The article continues—

but are of normal width and height and have 80,000 pounds capacity. Underframe construction, the roof and ends of the cars are of steel. They have air and hand brakes and meet all Interstate Commerce Commission safety appliances and interchange requirements.

In other words, Mr. President, they are good cars, 60 of them, just as good as the railroads are using anywhere in the United States. Yet the railroads are making no effort to use them, and apparently no committee of the Senate or the House is making any effort to have them used while the crops of the farmers of North Dakota are spoiling.

I have hundreds of letters, but I have brought with me one which is typical of the conditions our farmers confront. The letter was written on the 1st of October by Mr. B. S. Brewer, a farmer residing at Erie, N. Dak., which is in the Red River Valley, in the heart of the breadbasket of the country. He is one of the best known and most reliable farmers in North Dakota.

Mr. Brewer says:

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am a farmer in Erie, N. Dak., farming a section of land—

A section of land is 640 acres, in case anyone does not know that.

The letter continues:

Or at least I am trying to farm it, with such a terrible farm condition that we have out here now. I have been trying to buy a corn picker for 2 years. They are so scarce around here that we will not be able to get our corn in this year. I had to leave part of mine last year until spring, and then took a great loss. I did not get over half of it. I have had my order in for a Wood Bros. corn picker now for over 2 years but am not sure of one yet. The corn is getting ripe and will be ready to pick soon.

Mr. LANGER, is there anything that you could do to get me an order that I can get a corn picker in time to pick my corn and help some of my neighbors pick theirs? If you can, I will certainly appreciate it. I

have a lot of hogs and cattle to feed this winter, and must have the corn to feed them, or else will be forced to sell them now. I will take any good make of a corn picker, but prefer Wood Bros.

Mr. LANGER, there will have to be something done about the farmers here in North Dakota or there will not be many farmers left. The farmer is not getting a square deal at all. We are just as patriotic as anyone, but we just cannot last at the way the farmers' affairs are run down there in Washington. We work from 16 to 20 hours a day, and just cannot make a living at \$1.18 to \$1.20 a bushel for our wheat, when we have to pay \$7 and \$8 per day and board and room for the kind of help that we can get. Farmers are quitting by the hundreds this fall—

If anyone has any doubt about it, Mr. President, let him look at any North Dakota newspapers, and see the auction sales being advertised there.

The letter continues:

And I fear for the food problem, if there is not a drastic change made in the farm problems. We must have something done about farm equipment and farm labor or else the farmers cannot continue. All the guns, planes, tanks, ships, and all the rest of our war equipment will be useless without food for the men behind it.

Mr. LANGER, I know you are very busy, but please do all that you can to help me get a corn picker before it is too late this fall, and it will surely be very, very much appreciated.

Mr. President, as I have said, that letter is typical. In my office I have hundreds of similar letters. I call the attention of the Senate again to the fact that the patriotic farmers in North Dakota produce more wheat than do the farmers of any other State of the Union; that they have led the entire Nation, per capita, in the purchase of War bonds; that they are a loyal, hard-working, honest people, but they have not gotten a square deal, as every Senator on this floor knows. Wheat is the only basic commodity the price of which is not up to parity.

From the telegram by prominent State officials, we find that 1,100 elevators cannot take another bushel of grain, and that the farmers are threshing, and are using every possible means of distributing their wheat or flax or barley. The farmers pile it up on the ground; and, as is said in the telegram signed by responsible State officials elected by the people out there, those crops are spoiling. Yet we who are in Washington are told that something must be done about the food situation.

So, Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, requesting that an investigation be properly made. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the committee at once, and that the committee be requested to take action as quickly as it possibly can, for unless action is taken quickly, hundreds, if not thousands, of farmers will be ruined.

Mr. BARKLEY. The resolution would ordinarily be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce in due course.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 185) to investigate the causes of, and means for relieving, the shortage of railroad cars for the trans-

portation of grains in the Northwestern States was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the causes of the existing shortage of railroad cars for the transportation of wheat, flax, and other grains in the Northwestern States, and (2) means of relieving such shortage. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$20,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Evening Star for October 1, 1943. The article is entitled "60 New Boxcars Are Offered For Sale in Newspaper Ads."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIXTY NEW BOXCARS ARE OFFERED FOR SALE IN NEWSPAPER ADS

Railroad facilities are burdened to capacity with wartime freight loads, but 60 nearly new boxcars were advertised for sale here today—to anyone with the purchase price and an engine to haul them away.

To make the offer more attractive, the owner, the Warren Tank Car Co., of Warren, Pa., promised to paint the cars without extra charge and to letter on the name or numerals of the purchaser.

Melvin D. Hildreth, attorney at 1420 New York Avenue NW., who inserted newspaper ads for the tank car company, said he was certain "someone would be interested, in view of the difficulty of obtaining railroad rolling stock today."

Mr. Hildreth said, however, that he had failed in attempts to dispose of the cars to Government agencies interested in the transportation problem.

The 60 cars were built to order for an ordnance plant, but reverted to the Warren Car Co. when work at the plant was discontinued after the cars had hauled munitions only a few weeks, he explained.

They are only 36 feet long—4 feet less than standard—but are of normal width and height and have 80,000 pounds capacity, he added. Underframe construction, the roof and ends of the cars are of steel. They have air and hand brakes and meet all Interstate Commerce Commission safety appliance and interchange requirements, he added.

The price remains to be set at a conference between the owner and purchaser, but will be less than \$3,000 for each car, Mr. Hildreth said.

The company wants to make sure the cars will remain in railroad use, he added, explaining that sales will not be made to brokers.

DEFERMENT OF FATHERS FROM THE DRAFT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 763) exempting certain married men who have children from liability under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I listened with interest today to the eloquent speech of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], because I had read in the newspaper that he was about to criticize the substitute amendment which I have presented. So far as I can see there was no criticism in his speech of my substitute. He seemed to admit the necessity for dealing in some way with the industrial deferment question, and also for dealing in some way with the physical deferment question. He did not at all deal with the question of dividing the married men into categories separating those under 30 years of age from those over 30 years of age.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I had so many things in mind that I did not reach the Senator's substitute. Later I intend to comment on it.

Mr. TAFT. I understood that the Senator had concluded his remarks.

Mr. HILL. I had concluded my remarks on the bill. The Senator's proposal is in the form of a substitute amendment. I expect to comment on the Senator's substitute amendment to the bill. My remarks today were devoted to the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I was mistaken in thinking that the Senator had finished.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Alabama apparently reached a conclusion, but not the conclusion which the Senator from Ohio thought he had reached. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. In other words, there will be a second conclusion.

During the remarks of the Senator from Alabama there was inserted in the Record a letter from General Marshall attacking my amendment, and attacking specific division of married men into two groups, those over 30 and those under 30.

I should like to answer very briefly the statements made in that letter. The letter reads as follows:

OCTOBER 4, 1943.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The Secretary of War has referred to me your request for my views on the proposed amendment of Senator Taft to the pending bill S. 763 providing for the deferment of certain married men with children depending upon age. I am advised by Selective Service that the effect of Senator Taft's amendment would be that the armed forces would receive only men attaining the age of 18 and over the age of 30 after about February 1, 1944.

It has been assumed all through the hearings, and the general says later, that the Army strength of 7,700,000 men may be considered for present purposes its ultimate strength, and that all that will be needed thereafter will be replacements. Every year we have 1,200,000

boys coming into the 18-year age class, and it has been assumed that replacements would come from that group. Apparently this letter assumes that we are not through. If we now draft 500,000 fathers, we must look forward to drafting another 1,000,000 or so in 1944. At least, the argument is made on that assumption. I think it is an unwise assumption. I think we should work on the assumption that we may not need more than 500,000 fathers, even if we go into the question of drafting fathers.

The letter continues as follows:

From a military standpoint the induction of men within age groups in a predetermined order, namely, those under 25, next those between 25 and 30, and then from 30 to 38 is unsound.

It is, however, the method pursued in most of the military countries of the world and has been so pursued for many years.

I continue reading:

Men being taken at this time and in the future for military service are for use from 4 to 16 months hence, depending upon the type of training required.

In other words, these men are not necessary now, but will be necessary from 4 to 16 months from now, when finally they may perhaps be trained. We are to take 500,000 fathers immediately in order to start training them for use many months from now.

I continue reading:

While the Army is now approaching its ultimate strength a number of units must be filled during the remainder of this year. Most of these are service elements in which older men can best be used.

It appears now that fathers, particularly fathers over 30 years of age, are to be taken and put into the service elements. We have been pointing out all day that that is where the IV-F men could be used. For that service the Army does not need young, active men. It could use the IV-F men instead of the fathers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I submit that the Senator should distinguish between limited-service men, who have to have limited service because of some physical disability, and service troops. Service troops go right up to the front line and into combat. Many of them must be physically qualified men. There is a difference between service troops and limited-service men.

Mr. TAFT. If that be true, younger men are needed for service troops just as much as for combat troops.

Mr. HILL. I will not interrupt the Senator further, but there is quite a difference.

Mr. TAFT. The letter continues as follows:

Next year the bulk of men will, in all probability, be required for replacements to combat troops, and they should represent the younger and most vigorous types.

During the next year 1,200,000 young men will become of military age.

The letter continues:

If Selective Service is required to furnish the Army only those men under 30 years of age during the remainder of this year, and those over 30 next year, it would appear that the younger men must, of necessity, be placed in service units in order that those units will be ready when required.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the subject of the younger men, the testimony before the committee shows that at the present time, without any consideration being given to combat replacements due to battle casualties, the number of men required for replacements is about 75,000 a month, or 900,000 a year. So without regard to battle casualties, which must become greater and greater as the fighting grows in intensity, approximately 900,000 of the men becoming 18 years of age will be required, if they are qualified, as replacements at the present time.

Mr. TAFT. I do not wish to examine the testimony at the present time, but if the Senator will examine the testimony, I believe he will find that the 75,000 replacements a month include battle replacements, unless there should ensue a campaign of a much more deadly character than any we have had so far.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will find that 75,000 was the average at the time the testimony was given. Either General Marshall or General McNarney—I do not remember which; perhaps both—stated that as we actually fought and had battle casualties as a result of the fighting, the number of replacements would increase proportionately.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is mistaken. We can examine the hearings tomorrow.

I continue reading from the letter:

The older men will then be received in large concentrations and must, therefore, be trained as battle replacements.

That also seems to me to be a rather extraordinary statement. If the service troops are right up with the combat troops, I do not see much difference in age requirements as between combat troops and service troops. Certainly the younger men who serve as service troops could easily be used as combat troops. Their training would be very valuable for combat service. They could then be replaced in the service battalions, if necessary, by the older men with shorter training. It seems to me that the argument as to the necessity of drafting men all the way from 20 to 38 years of age today in order to have a certain number of older men who otherwise would be put off until next year, is almost completely fallacious.

I continue reading from the letter:

Such an arrangement appears unsound and not in the best military interest, since the only pool from which battle-casualty replacements could be secured, if Senator Taft's proposed amendment is enacted into law, would be from the category of men older than 30 years, and those later becoming 18.

But again, the fact is, of course, that actual battle replacements will all come from the younger men, who became 18

years of age, of whom there are 1,200,000 becoming available every year.

I continue reading:

Also, it would appear unfair to the older men and to the service to so time their induction as to force the majority into combat units as loss replacements.

Very likely most of the fathers, even up to 38 years of age, if they get into the service at all, would rather be in the combat troops than in the so-called service battalions digging ditches and making airfields. The whole program seems to be one of taking fathers from 30 to 38 years of age, men who have risen in life and obtained responsible positions in the professions and various branches of business, and putting them into service troops in order that they may dig ditches in Italy. That appears to be the argument presented by the Chief of Staff in this extraordinary letter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator must realize that service organizations are not limited to the digging of ditches. Of course, that is a convenient catch phrase; but we know that service units encompass all sorts of things, including driving trucks almost up to the battle line with ammunition. The Senator must realize that there may be a difference between the physical qualifications of men performing that kind of service and those of men on foot on long marches with guns on their shoulders. The Senator recognizes that difference, I am sure.

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not. I maintain that a service battalion in Italy is under just as strong physical pressure as are the men in the combat troops. I maintain that no difference will be found on the battle front between service troops subjected to physical strain and men who are in the combat troops.

I continue reading:

The Army must meet its personnel requirements on schedule, and this cannot be done if the Army is required to reshuffle and retrain personnel because it has not received a fair and average cross section of age and physical condition.

The training of the men has been planned upon a basis of receiving such a cross section. My sole concern is the procurement of men with proper qualifications in the required numbers and at the necessary times.

Legislation which would compel the induction of men by age groups or upon other artificial standards would threaten the orderly flow of the Nation's military manpower in the armed forces and, I believe, would hinder its efficient utilization.

Certainly an age group is not an artificial standard. We already have that standard in the act. The ages are 18 to 38.

I should like to contrast that with General Marshall's testimony. Last month, in reply to a question by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], he testified as follows:

Senator BRIDGES. General, in view of the experience of the Army with younger men, the success of the younger men as contrasted with older men, do you think it would be practical to limit the father draft, we will say, from fathers between 18 and 30 rather

than going up from 30 to 38, and thus get into an age class that has not been too successful?

General MARSHALL. Well, I will say in general that the younger ages are better for us to handle. Just what effect it would have in the manpower problem if you eliminated fathers over 30, I do not know. But we find it a simpler matter and quicker business to train and prepare the younger men.

Mr. President, this letter bears every evidence of having been brought here by those who are opposed to the pending bill for the purpose of defeating the bill. It is a violation of General Marshall's own testimony; I should like to have every Member of the Senate read this letter and try to analyze the argument that is made in it, and see whether he does not find it a ridiculous non sequitur.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is nothing whatever inconsistent between the letter of General Marshall and his testimony. Of course, the Army prefers the younger men, but where there is not a large enough pool, as General Marshall and all the officers of the Army and Navy and the Manpower Commission and the Selective Service say—and it is necessary to take all their testimony together in order to arrive at a logical conclusion—if the pool which they need and from which they must draw the required number of men does not contain enough men under 30 to meet their requirements, then of course, they must have a cross section ranging from the ages 18 to 38, according to the law Congress passed.

Mr. TAFT. I would question the Senator's statement. There is no assumption that the pool is insufficient. So far as any testimony in the record is concerned, we can get all the men the services are now asking for by taking the married men under 30, and using the younger men to come in as replacements. That does not take account of the suggestion made here today, that the Navy is not only asking for 3,000,000 men by the first of January, but that they are asking for 500,000 additional men during the first 6 months of 1944. I do not know about that. The Naval Affairs Committee has not passed upon it. No necessity has yet been shown, and there is no testimony in the record to prove it, so I do not think we can assume that we are going to have to draft 1,500,000 fathers.

Certainly, if that is the understanding, there will be much more support for the bill of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], because the general impression has been that only a limited number of families are to be broken up. If we are to proceed on the assumption that we are to break up a million and a half American families, then I think we had better delay the whole matter until we can study the question of manpower.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, there is no assumption of that sort so far as the requirement for raising 7,700,000 men is concerned, as fixed by the Army, by the end of this year. No one on the committee or on the floor has made such a suggestion. Whether there would have to be any more fathers drawn into the Army would depend entirely on the

length of the war, upon the intensity of the fighting, and the number of casualties caused by reason of the fighting. No one has suggested that in order to raise the number of men immediately required a million and a half fathers would have to be drafted, or any more than the 446,000.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Alabama suggested that the more successful the fighting is, the fewer number we will have to have in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the Senator has put the correct interpretation on the remarks of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before I go further, I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning endorsing my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTIVE FATHER DRAFT

There is a profound difference in spirit and purpose between Senator WHEELER's bill to ban the drafting of pre-war fathers before January and the substitute proposal introduced by Senator TAFT last week on behalf of a bipartisan Senate group. A majority in the Senate appears to be convinced that the size of the Army should be determined by the military authorities. If Senator WHEELER's proposed ban were to become effective, the Army maintains that it could not obtain the number of men it requires. No similar objections can be raised against the Taft plan that merely seeks to make the selection of recruits more selective without absolutely prohibiting the drafting of any group of men required to meet Army demands.

The proposal to call all fathers under 30 before drafting older men and to require Selective Service approval of occupational deferment for workers under 30 would reduce the number of drafted men with heavy family responsibilities to a minimum. Since age is of prime importance in distinguishing between men with a large number of dependents and those with none or only a few dependents, we conclude that age classifications provide a very reasonable basis for comprising the controversy over the drafting of fathers.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to say to the Senator quite firmly that I have talked with the Selective Service officials, and am familiar with the testimony before the committee. We talked about 446,000 fathers, but that number is only what the Army is going to take up to January 1. General Marshall testified before the committee that he hoped they would have to have only that number of men; but only 200,000 of those fathers are going into the Army. The others are going into the Navy.

The Senator from Alabama indicated that after the first of the year the Navy's requirements will make it necessary to go into the ranks of the fathers to the extent of at least 750,000 up to a million, which means the taking of practically every father in the United States who is physically fit for service.

As a matter of fact, General Hershey has said to me—I do not think there is any secret about it—that even out of this fathers' pool, if the Navy is to take all the men it certainly is going to require, it will be necessary to take every physically fit father in the country, and he does not know where physically fit fathers are to be obtained with the standards as they are today.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know all Admiral King may have told the Selective Service, but I read his testimony, and I saw no indication of increase in the Navy beyond 3,000,000 men. That would make a total for the armed forces of about 10,800,000. I have always felt that up to that number the country could stand it, and that we should grant that number if they were requested. I feel very strongly that if we are to go above that number, there should be a complete study of the whole manpower situation, to determine what this country can do, whether we can conquer the world, whether we can supply all our allies with lend-lease material, whether we can carry on a world-wide war, in which we assume the burden of all the supplies for a great many of the civilian population. But I have not understood that we have reached that point. I think for the present we are working on the old assumption that the Army and Navy want 10,800,000 in the armed forces, and if that is what they want, they can get from the fathers under 30 those they still need. That is the reason for the amendment I have suggested.

Mr. WHEELER. All I have to go on is exactly what General Hershey said to me, borne out by what the Senator from Alabama said today, that in order to get what the Navy wants—if I may have the attention of the Senator from Alabama—

Mr. HILL. I am listening to the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. They are going to have to take at least 500,000 fathers, in addition to the 446,000, after the first of the year. I ask the Senator whether that is correct.

Mr. HILL. I would say that if the Navy gets the men they need to man the new ships and planes to come in after January 1, it will be necessary to take some additional fathers. The Army will want 75,000 for replacements, the Navy's figure is about 92,000 a month, which makes 167,000 each month. I do not think, from what the Selective Service has advised me, that we can get the 167,000 entirely from young men who become 18 years of age, or from what they call replacements, that is, those taken out of industry, or perhaps some of the class IV-F's. There will be some fathers, probably, who will have to be drafted to meet the figure of 167,000 each month, over the period of 6 months, from January 1 to July 1.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, it depends on how many men can be gotten out of the industrial deferred class, and how many it is possible to get out of IV-F. Is it not true that the Navy has never presented to the Committee on Naval Affairs any such demand for men, that that never has been authorized by the Congress,

and that no one has seen the basis of the figures upon which that request has apparently been suggested by the Navy to the Selective Service Director? It seems to me something we cannot take into consideration when dealing with this problem.

Mr. HILL. The Senator says we cannot take it into consideration. I desire to be absolutely frank and candid always with the Senate. I say to the Senator and to the Senate that from the hearings before the committee, from Admiral King's testimony, and from the information I have received from the Selective Service, it would seem that we are going to have to take in from January 1 to July 1 approximately 167,000 men each month, and from the information the Selective Service has given me I think it extremely doubtful that 167,000 men can be secured or will be secured from among nonfathers.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Alabama refer me to any place in the testimony where Admiral King even suggests that 500,000 more men are going to be requested?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that that testimony was off the record. Admiral King, as I recall the testimony, was testifying at that time with reference to new ships and new planes which were going to be produced and come into use from January 1 to July 1, 1944.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. HILL. And then of course the question arose, "What about the manning of these ships and planes." And as I recall the Admiral's testimony, it indicated that the Navy would need about 90,000 men for replacements, and for the manning of the additional ships and planes over a period of 6 months beginning on January 1.

Mr. TAFT. As I understood, of the 92,000 about 70,000 are to be new men?

Mr. HILL. I will say that according to the testimony the Navy estimates it needs some 25,000 for replacement purposes. That would mean then that about 65,000 would be needed as additional men to man the new ships and new planes which will be produced and come into use by the Navy.

Mr. WHEELER. I think the Senator from Alabama is correct with respect to what the Admiral testified. That is correct according to the information that was given to me by General Hershey.

Mr. HILL. I wish to make it clear also, because I want the Senator to have the benefit of any information I may have been able to glean, that the 25,000 men as replacements for the Navy are in addition to the 75,000 men needed as replacements for the Army.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I understand that. But what I want to point out is that this fact, which is off the record, is for the first time an official suggestion that we are going beyond the figure of 10,800,000 men for the armed forces to a figure which approximates 11,500,000, and that that policy is one which certainly, it occurs to me, should be passed upon by Congress before it is spoken of as an established policy of the United States Government.

Mr. HILL. I do not know that I can put my hand at this moment on any testimony in the record, but I think the figure of 11,000,000 or 11,100,000, or 11,200,000, has certainly been under discussion throughout the period of the months since we first began to attempt to find out what the size of the Army and Navy would be. I think the figure is 11,000,000. Then there is another thing the Senator must realize about these figures. Remember that these figures for the Army and the Navy include the women, the WAC's and the WAVES, although they do not run so very high, and I am not sure that when we began to discuss these figures we included the women.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that the WAC's and the WAVES take the places of men. Let me ask the Senator a question. Has any over-all study been made by way of comparison of the Army needs and the Navy needs? Has any such study been made by the General Staff to be sure that they are not asking for men both in the Army and Navy to do the same thing? Obviously the marines' tasks overlap those of the Army. Obviously the various service brigades which make up a tremendous number in both Army and Navy may be planning to do exactly the same work, unless there has been some close study and coordination. Does the Senator know whether that subject has been studied?

Mr. HILL. I cannot speak for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but I cannot think that they have not considered these questions. That is the very purpose of having Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am not sure that the Senator heard my remarks made earlier in the day. As I said in my remarks, not only do we have Joint Chiefs of Staff, but there is a joint chiefs of staff planning committee, which is composed of representatives of both the Army and the Navy to work out these plans. Of course the obvious reason for having the joint committee is that it may consider the very things the Senator from Ohio has suggested.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, of course if we are to accept the philosophy which has been expounded on the floor of the Senate by certain Senators who are opposing the bill, and who are following the administration's view, namely to the effect that we must leave the matter up to the Army and to the Navy, and follow blindly whatever its leaders say, then if representatives of the Army and the Navy come before us and say they want 15,000,000 men we must supposedly, give them whatever they say they want, regardless of the effect upon the morale of the people or the economic structure of the United States generally.

Mr. Baruch stated that we ought to follow whatever General Marshall said. I think there is a very serious question as to whether we can have as many as 11,000,000 men in the armed services, and certainly if we are to take every physically fit married man in the country into the armed services, then I think we will completely break down the morale of the people and we will completely break

down the economic structure in the United States.

Mr. President, we have the greatest air force in the world. We are turning out more airplanes than any other country. We are going to have the greatest Navy in the world. We are giving billions of dollars for lend-lease. We are assuming a tremendous task, and giving away the substance of the United States and the raw materials and the finished products. The result will be that we will wreck the United States of America, simply because we follow blindly what every Army or naval chief says when he comes before us.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that the argument that we cannot defer the fathers until the first of the year, that we do not have the time to recomb all those who have been deferred, falls down on the basis of the statistics furnished the Military Affairs Committee at the request of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself with respect to the training history of men who are now in our camps. The number of men who have been in training for from 1 year to 2 years is 1,172,000; from 2 years to 3 years, 510,000, for 3 years or more, 84,000.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator. I remember when the information was requested.

Mr. President, let us consider those figures. Let us then say that we shall take the fathers of the country, that we must have them in the next 3 months, that if we do not obtain them in the next 3 months we shall lose the war, or it will materially affect the war. Can we say that in view of the fact that we have in the Army at the present time more men who have been trained 1 year, and more men who have been trained 2 years, than can possibly be shipped overseas by the end of this year?

Mr. President, I do not care whether General Marshall makes the statement or whether the Commander in Chief makes the statement; when someone makes a statement which is preposterous upon its face, the common sense and the sanity of the American people should deal with it as preposterous. If it does not appeal to the common sense and the sanity of the Members of the Senate, but they still follow blindly whatever is stated, how can the people of the country have any confidence in parliamentary government or in the Senate?

As was pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], there are in the United States 1,172,000 men who have had over 1 year's training. There are 510,000 men in the United States who have had over 2 years' training. Eighty-four thousand men in the United States have had over 3 years of training. When General Marshall says, "I must have these married men in the next 3 months, or the country will go to pieces, and we may lose the war," does he mean he will take 200,000 married men—fathers—

and immediately put them into divisions which will be sent overseas, when he already has men who have been trained for 1, 2, or 3 years? It is simply preposterous on its face; it simply does not make good sense.

In all fairness to General Marshall, let me say, in connection with the emphasis which has been placed upon his statement before the committee, that it must be remembered that he was making an offhand statement. He was being questioned by Senators who were asking, "Won't you lose the war, and won't you do this and do that, if you do not get the fathers?" What must be studied is General McNarney's statement about the size of the Army. We must consider what the men who now are in the Army are being used for. General McNarney gave the figures in relation to what the men were wanted for. If Senators will refer to the figures I stated Friday afternoon to an almost empty Chamber, they will realize that the Army does not need 200,000 fathers at the present time, that there would be plenty of time if the 200,000 fathers were deferred from Army service for 3 months, and then, if the whole manpower problem were studied, and if the IV-F's were rescreened, if some of them were taken. If that were done it would not be necessary to take even one father.

The only thing the opposition have to hang their case on is the fact that General Marshall has said, "I have got to have these men between now and January 1, to fill up divisions. If I do not get them to fill up the divisions, I will have to break up some other divisions."

Would it not be far better to break up some of the other divisions, to take out of some of the divisions trained men who otherwise would remain in the United States, than it would be to shove fathers, without any training or with only a few months' training, into divisions which are to be sent overseas?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Montana has spoken of General Marshall's testimony. I received the impression that the Senator was expressing the thought that General Marshall was testifying without a prepared statement, and was being subjected to questions, and that possibly General Marshall may not have presented the matter exactly as he might have felt about it. Is that correct?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I am simply saying that in my judgment the statement General Marshall gave must be taken, because it was an offhand statement—and I think we all know General Marshall has a tremendous job—

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. He is flying between England and the United States, and Italy and the United States, and north Africa and the United States; and he is not as familiar, and could not possibly be as familiar, with the conditions which exist as was and is his Chief of Staff. He said he would have to break up some of the divisions if he could not get the fathers.

Mr. HILL. Yes; the Senator is correct; and let me say that before General Marshall was questioned at all, and before he subjected himself to questioning, he concluded his statement with the following words—this was his direct statement:

I apologize if I have expressed myself rather vigorously, but I must admit I feel rather intense about this, and I wanted to make it as clear as I could what the conditions are as I see them. Now, I am ready to answer any questions that you wish to ask.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. That does not add or detract anything from what I have said.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has referred to the fact that General Marshall has flown to London and has flown to north Africa. The trips the general has made to London for a week or so, and to north Africa for a week or so, certainly did not consume sufficient time to prevent him from keeping his fingers on the department over which he presides.

Mr. WHEELER. In answer to that, Mr. President, I say the only thing we have to do is to read General McNarney's testimony which he gave in a prepared statement, and then read General Marshall's statement. I say, with all due respect to General Marshall's statement, that General McNarney broke down the facts and figures, whereas General Marshall's statements were of a general character.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, General McNarney went into greater detail than did General Marshall; but there is nothing inconsistent between the testimony of the two generals.

Mr. WHEELER. I say that taking into consideration General Marshall's statement, we must review and take into consideration General McNarney's statement. Does the Senator think that newly inducted fathers who have not had any training, and will not have any training except for a few weeks, should be shipped overseas with the divisions that are to be shipped overseas, instead of taking men who have been in training for over a year or 2 or 3 years? Does the Senator believe that trained troops should be left in the United States, although the fathers are taken? I say that simply does not make sense. I do not care whether General Marshall says it or who says it. It simply does not make common sense to anyone who will analyze the figures.

Mr. President, other Senators have stated, and I have stated repeatedly, that under the selective-service law the matter rests entirely with the President of the United States. Of course, I know the President has to a large extent left the matter up to the Army and the Navy; but it seems to me that the time has come when the President should recognize the fact that he cannot leave all the details and that Congress cannot leave everything to the Army and the Navy; because the Army and the Navy look at matters purely from one standpoint, not from the general outlook. General

Marshall made it plain that all he wanted was to have the men. It seems to me the President should look at the matter from the standpoint of production in this country, from the standpoint of whether the drafting of fathers will break down our civilian economy, whether it will drive small businessmen out of business. The President should look at the matter from the standpoint of what the effect will be on the moral conditions, and whether it will cause delinquency among the children of the country.

I was one of the first Members of the Senate of the United States and of the Congress to advocate—away back in 1932—the nomination and election of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as President of the United States. I did so while many persons who now are claiming to be new dealers and great Roosevelt followers were sitting back in their chairs, and never mentioned where they stood, and many of them were against Mr. Roosevelt until they found out he was elected, and they thought the popular thing to do was to get on the band wagon. But I supported him in 1932 because I felt Mr. Roosevelt was interested in preserving the homes of the people of the United States. I was for him because I thought he was interested in preserving little business in this country, and was against monopoly and was against the concentration of power in the hands of some of the great monopolies and great corporations. I was for him because I felt he was interested in the future generations of the children of America; and I was interested in him because I felt he would be opposed to our involvement in European wars. I supported him in 1932 before the convention, and I traveled from one end of the country to the other in his behalf. I went into North Dakota for him to line up the North Dakota delegation. I went into Minnesota, and into almost every other State in the Union west of the Mississippi River. I have supported the social legislation and the social programs which he has advocated.

I now appeal to the President of the United States, who has heretofore stood for social progress, who has heretofore been against breaking up American homes, and who has been for looking after the children of America—I appeal to him now as Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States, and the only man who has a right to tell the Army and Navy that they must not break up American homes and drive children into the streets, thus increasing juvenile delinquency, to stop the action which is going on, and tell the Army and Navy to reclassify the IV-F men, of whom there are many hundreds of thousands. General Hershey said—and I take his word for it—that 2,000,000 men could be obtained from the IV-F classification.

I appeal to the President of the United States to insist that the men who are being hoarded in factories be taken out, and that single men be taken before we break up homes by drafting fathers.

The responsibility is his and it is upon him alone. It is apparent that the Con-

gress of the United States will not act unless the President gives the word and says it may be done. I realize that pressure is coming from the administration; but I cannot believe that if he were thoroughly conversant with the facts and realized what the effects will be, Mr. Roosevelt, who has been for a great social program, would want to see us adopt the same policies which Mr. Hitler has adopted, and put American children into institutions and break up American homes, after the pattern of what has been done in Germany. I cannot believe that one who hates the Nazi philosophy as he hates it wants to follow in the footsteps of Mr. Hitler by doing identically the same thing which Hitler is doing with reference to children, and break up American homes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no desire to consume any of the time of the Senate at this time, and I shall not do so. However, I cannot allow the remarks of the Senator from Montana to go into the Record without at least making this observation:

I believe that the President of the United States realizes as fully as anybody could realize for him his responsibility under the Constitution of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. He also realizes his responsibility under the Selective Service Act, which conferred upon him certain power with regard to its administration.

Amazing as it may seem to those who are not familiar with the President's intimate and detailed knowledge of all the elements which enter into this question, the President is cognizant of the situation. He has given consideration to all those elements, including those suggested by the Senator from Montana and other Senators, and he has done as much as was humanly possible for him to do in order to meet the requirements of our military and naval situation and protect American homes.

No one has a monopoly on interest in the American home. I am quite certain that no one has a greater interest in the American home than has the President of the United States. He has shown his interest in every act of his administration and every policy which he has inaugurated. I am sure that the President of the United States is not afraid to assume the responsibility which is his, and assume it in the light of all the facts, in the light of his own knowledge of the situation which confronts our country, the type of Army and Navy we must have, the type of war we are engaged in, and the inside information with respect to the type of fighting which will be necessary in order that that war may be speedily and successfully won, so that we may not only protect American homes, but also protect all American life from unnecessary slaughter because of any mistakes which may be made in undertaking to carry it forward in the best and most efficient way possible.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Amos E. Taylor to be Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oliver P. Hopkins to be Assistant Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond C. Miller to be Assistant Director of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 5, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 4 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Robert E. Hannegan, of St. Louis, Mo., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue in place of Hon. Guy T. Helvering, whose nomination for a Federal judgeship in Kansas has been confirmed.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. John Russell Deane (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Albert Coady Wedemeyer (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 4 (legislative day of September 15), 1943:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Amos E. Taylor, to be Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Oliver P. Hopkins to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Raymond C. Miller to be Assistant Director, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Alfred L. Holloman	George W. Comstock
Kenneth Grant	Anthony J. Lund
James Lloyd Elliott	Herbert Tabor
Herbert E. Pedersen	Robert M. Thomas
Joseph L. Bryant	Spurgeon M. Wingo

To be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Romeo J. Gentile	Hugh L. C. Wilkerson
George K. Massengill	Charles M. McGill
David J. Zaugg	

To be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from August 1, 1943:

Frank S. Fellows	Jacob P. Eberhardt
Elmer A. Carberry	Anthony P. Rubino

William C. Lewis to be a temporary passed assistant surgeon, to rank as such from September 1, 1943.

To be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from September 1, 1943:

Alfred L. Holloman
Kenneth M. Joye
John A. Lewis
Joseph A. Bell to be a temporary senior surgeon, to rank as such from September 1, 1943.

Robert H. Onstott to be a temporary medical director, to rank as such from September 1, 1943.

Elmer J. Herringer to be a sanitary engineer, to rank as such from September 1, 1943.

Gordon E. McCallum to be a passed assistant sanitary engineer, Regular Corps, effective date of oath.

Edmund J. Schmidt to be an assistant surgeon, Regular Corps, effective date of oath.

George Shipman to be an assistant surgeon, Regular Corps, effective date of oath.

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

John B. Spriggs	Emery F. Word
Carruth J. Wagner	Lyman C. Burgess

To be temporary surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Curtis R. Chaffin	Eric C. Johnson
Erwin C. Drescher	Earl L. White
Paul T. Erickson	Joseph S. Spoto
John B. Hozier	

To be temporary senior surgeons, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

Leroy E. Burney
Robert H. Felix

To be temporary senior sanitary engineers, to rank as such from July 1, 1943:

John J. Bloomfield
Judson L. Robertson, Jr.

Raymond A. Vonderlehr to be a temporary medical director, to rank as such from July 1, 1943.

Calvin B. Spencer to be a surgeon, to rank as such from October 8, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Stella K. Martin, Plantersville.
Benjamin L. Edmonds, West Blockton.

KANSAS

Regina Cannon, Beattie.
Clara Sainer, Bison.
Nina Short, Concordia.
Mary E. Carpenter, Goddard.
Herbert E. Walter, Kingman.

KENTUCKY

Charles B. Cox, Benton.
Kenneth T. Marquette, Falmouth.

NORTH DAKOTA

Edwin H. Naumann, Kramer.
Curtis L. Wright, Michigan.
Nick F. Schammel, Tolley.

RHODE ISLAND

Elton L. Clark, North Scituate.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ray E. Young, Due West.
Andrew M. Blair, Rion.
William F. Griffin, Travellers Rest.

WEST VIRGINIA

J. B. Puryear, Jr., Holden.
Martha J. Snyder, Shepherdstown.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we praise Thee for our country; it is an ideal and a vision which may be realized by the humblest child. We pray Thee for a season of renewal by widening our range of affection, by the amplitude of service which we can enlarge in unity with every good and needful work. We beseech Thee to give strength of body, minds of deep conviction and courageous spirits to the Congress and to the highest tribunal of our Republic.

Heavenly Father, help us to discern the full pattern of human life and happiness. There are social ills to be overthrown, economic conditions which breed poverty, the curse of alcohol and wrongs which come from tenement districts; these evils are vast with peril to our destiny. Inspire our great land with the

Christway of service; deliver us from the misfortunes and the sufferings caused by selfish men who would despoil it of its true worth and dignity. Dear Lord, enrich our souls and fill them with rich treasures which overflow to lift and bless other lands. Whether our gifts be large or small, enable us to build them into God and man; all things else whatsoever shall fail and go. We pray Thee to shield us from the tragedy of the talent which was wrapped in distrust, selfishness, and, at last, failure. In the name of our blessed Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 30, 1943, was read and approved.

APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 21, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as chairman of the select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 313), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That CLAIR ENGLE, of the State of California, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Mines and Mining and World War Veterans' Legislation.

The resolution was agreed to.

REORGANIZATION OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, today I shall introduce a public-health bill.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to authorize a reorganization of the unwieldy administrative structure of the Public Health Service. Hearings were held on S. 400 by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and that committee reported the bill favorably with certain amendments. The bill, as amended, passed the Senate unanimously. Even before the introduction of H. R. 649, the need for a reorganization of the Public Health Service had been the subject of study by your committee. As a result of the study which the committee has given this matter and the hearings which have been held on this bill the committee is convinced that only a thorough-going codification and revision of all of the laws relating to the Public Health Service will accomplish the purposes of H. R. 649 and S. 400.

In order to understand why such a revision and codification is necessary, there must be considered the process by which the Public Health Service has evolved by succession of laws from a small corps of doctors authorized in 1789 to give medical and hospital relief to American seamen of the merchant marine to its present position as the central health organization of the Federal Government with many functions and major responsibilities vital to the welfare and safety of the Nation, both in war and peace.

It is evident that the Public Health Service has grown by gradual accretion of functions and divisions. The laws establishing these functions and divisions generally were passed one at a time and often without any attempt to fit the added functions and divisions into the pattern which had previously been established. For these reasons there not only is an unwieldy and inconsistent administrative structure, but there are also many obsolete, inconsistent and overlapping provisions of law pertaining to the functions of the Public Health Service.

The bill is designed to bring together in one enactment all of the laws relating to the Public Health Service, to permit the administrative reorganization authorized by H. R. 649 and S. 400, to adjust the wartime status of the commissioned corps of the service, to reconcile the conflicts and eliminate the overlapping in the law, and to make certain mechanical revisions found necessary by long administrative experience.

While the bill is not strictly a codification, it is in no sense a measure designed to place the Public Health Service into new fields of operation or to enlarge its functions and powers. Its sole purpose is to enable the Public Health Service to perform its present statutory functions more effectively.

PVT. HELEN F. VAN COUTREN

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I read an article that appeared in the St. Louis Star-Times, September 30:

TEN IN ST. LOUIS FAMILY SERVE IN ARMED FORCES

Pvt. Helen F. Van Coutren started her basic training as a WAC at Ft. Des Moines, Iowa, yesterday and thus became the tenth child of Mr. and Mrs. L. M. Van Coutren of 1292 Hamilton Boulevard, to serve in the present war. Her two sisters are WAC's, Pvt. Adine Van Coutren serving in Africa, and Pvt. Rita Van Coutren, stationed at Washington.

One brother, Thomas, is a sergeant in the Army, and six other brothers are in the Navy.

I congratulate this family on the great contribution it is making in the present emergency. It is a record that is seldom equaled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a statement by Roy Miller, vice

president, Navy League of the United States and State chairman for Navy Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record some observations made by me on the meat and sugar-beet situation in Montana and also on the situation in which the copper miners find themselves in that State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial from the Lorain (Ohio) Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business in order for the day and after any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include a letter from Mr. Hugh Smith, Philadelphia Better Business Bureau, and an address given by Mr. Smith at Cincinnati, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on three separate subjects, and include therein newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered,

I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 50 minutes on the dairy situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the Boston Daily Record of Monday, September 27, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader of the House, as given at the public meeting in connection with the fifteenth annual scientific assembly of the Medical Society of the District of Columbia in Washington, D. C., on October 1, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by Bill Cunningham that appeared in the Boston Herald of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article written by the Governor of South Dakota and appearing in the South Dakota Highway magazine; and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in three respects, one concerning the cot-

ton farmer and another concerning a subject discussed in three letters written by me which I shall include in my remarks, and in the third to include an article by Mr. Edgar L. Morphet, of the Florida State Department of Education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of socialized medicine, and further to extend my remarks on the question of the subsidy roll-back.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article appearing in yesterday's New York Times, by James B. Reston, who writes from London. The article is entitled "Russia Poses First Great Crisis of the Peace."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RUSSIA VEERING TO THE RIGHT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is gratifying to me, because I pointed out many months ago that Russia was veering to the right and that within a short space of time would demonstrate to the world that its aims are democratic and that justice will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I was highly gratified to hear the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] call to the attention of the House and the country the unbiased report on Russia by Captain Rickenbacker.

I have known the captain favorably for many years and still hold him in high esteem notwithstanding his unfavorable criticism of organized labor, but that was as an officer of one of the large air-transport companies. However, the report which he makes on Russia, to which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] calls attention and is inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is really an official report to and in the interest of our country.

I believe that every fair-minded American whose mind has not been poisoned by Nazi-Fascist propaganda against Soviet Russia will concede that Captain Rickenbacker's report and account of his interviews are based on facts and truths.

Nearly 2 years ago and before Hitler attacked Russia I stated on the floor that Russia in order to gain time was forced into making a treaty with Germany. Notwithstanding strong opposition in this country that action did not cause us to discontinue the shipping to Russia of machinery, tools, implements, and other war materials which they purchased and paid for with moneys deposited in our banks in advance.

While the Nazi propagandists were endeavoring to induce us to forget and divert our attention from the wholesale massacres of all those who failed to agree or follow Hitler's murderous aims, they were charging that Stalin had ordered the elimination of many Russian officers and had closed all churches, denying the people the right of worship. The Nazi propagandists did not state, however, that, unlike the murderous action of Hitler in the cases of certain German officers, civilians, peoples and officials of invaded countries, in his wholesale purges, the so-called Russian officers who were executed received a fair and open trial by Stalin, and that it was upon confessions and evidence that clearly showed they were on the pay roll of the Japanese and Nazis and had sought to undermine Russia that they were convicted and the deserved punishment meted out to them. I obtained a complete report at that time which indicated clearly that all Russia was seeking to accomplish was to separate the church from the state and was not opposed to free worship.

While President Roosevelt stated at that time that he had been assured there would be complete freedom of worship he was being continuously assailed and attacked by the Nazi propagandists and even by our own American pacifists and appeasers, and this notwithstanding that Russia had adopted a real constitution granting freedom and liberty to its people and eliminating many of Lenin's original policies. Russia was gradually and continuously veering to the right, and therefore I am pleased that since then the statements of the President have been justified. I recall stating that Communists promised a great deal—just as the Republican and Democratic platforms usually do, though the makers realized that all the pledges could not be fully carried out.

The statements of Captain Rickenbacker and of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] are timely and should put a stop to the activities of those few

Nazi ideologists and even those few misguided Communists in our country.

I congratulate Russia upon its great achievements and upon its continuous liberalizing of its policies affecting the welfare of its people. I believe when history is written that Russia will receive the recognition and credit to which it is entitled for having rendered to humanity, at such terrific cost, a service not only to its own people and country but to the democracies of the world.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

WARTIME CONSTRUCTION OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H. R. 3018) authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS ON THE PUBLIC LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2697, to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill gives the Secretary of the Interior unlimited authority to dispose of any properties on lands under his jurisdiction, even though that disposal may not be authorized by law—a jurisdiction entirely too great to be passed by unanimous consent. Therefore, I object, Mr. Speaker.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS TO THE CITY OF SITKA, ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 340, to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and convey certain lands to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] is on the floor and I would like to ask him to give a short explanation of this legislation.

Mr. DIMOND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Territorial Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to convey to the city of Sitka, Alaska, a strip of land for street purposes. The street will probably be about 6 feet wide, to the best of my knowledge and information.

Years ago all of the land involved belonged to the United States Government and it was used for an Army barracks. Then by act of Congress the land was conveyed to the Territory of Alaska with the understanding that it was to be used

as a home for aged pioneers. The Territorial Government spent about \$300,000 in putting up buildings as a home for the aged pioneers on the tract. Recently the population of the city of Sitka has increased and there is considerably more traffic on the streets now than there was years ago. In rehabilitating this street it was found desirable to widen it by about 6 feet, as I recall, at one point where the tract of the Pioneers' Home bulges out into the street, so to speak. It is desired to take a little part of this tract and use it for a street. The land desired for street purposes is not occupied by anything except as a lawn. That lawn could be narrowed and the people benefitted by the passage of this bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Certainly.

Mr. PRIEST. In the event the city at any time in the future ceases to use this land for street purposes would the title revert to the Government?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes. It is so provided in the original bill and so provided by amendment in the bill now before us.

Mr. RANKIN. The streets of Sitka are very, very narrow, are they not?

Mr. DIMOND. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Washington, our distinguished colleague of a few years ago, Hon. John F. Miller, who has now passed away, said that when Sitka was the capital of Alaska it was the only capital in the world that never had a horse in it, because the streets were so narrow they could not use them. So, Mr. Speaker, with all the territory we have in Alaska, comprising about 590,000 square miles, it seems to me we can very well afford to grant to the city of Sitka the few feet of ground necessary to make these streets passable. I hope there will be no objection of the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska is hereby authorized to grant and convey to the city of Sitka, Alaska, for street purposes, such portions of the lands conveyed to the Territory of Alaska by the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 502), as may be necessary or desirable for such purposes, without regard to reversionary provisions in section 2 of said act.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, following the comma, strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following:

"and not conveyed to the Sitka Cold Storage Co., by the act of August 16, 1937 (50 Stat. 652), as the city of Sitka shall designate are necessary or desirable for street purposes. Any conveyance made under this act shall be without regard to the reversionary provisions in section 2 of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 502).

"All oil, coal, or other materials in land designated and conveyed to the city of Sitka under this act, and the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same shall be reserved to the United States under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe."

Add the following new section:

"Sec. 2. The city of Sitka shall never sell or otherwise dispose of any part of the prop-

erty conveyed to it pursuant to the provisions of section 1 of this act; and if the same shall ever be abandoned for the uses herein declared the said premises shall revert to the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIXING A REASONABLE DEFINITION AND STANDARD OF IDENTITY OF CERTAIN DRY MILK SOLIDS

The Clerk read the next bill, H. R. 149, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 26, 1938 (ch. 675, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 1040), dry milk solids or defatted milk solids is the product resulting from the removal of fat and water from milk, and contains the lactose, milk proteins, and milk minerals in the same relative proportions as in the fresh milk from which made. It contains not over 5 percent moisture. The fat content is not over 1½ percent unless otherwise indicated.

The term "milk," when used herein, means sweet milk of cows.

With the following committee amendments:

The amendments are as follows:

Line 5, before "dry", insert "nonfat."

Line 9, after "centum", insert "by weight of."

Line 10, after "centum", insert "by weight."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids."

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1242, to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that application has been made for a rule to consider this bill in Committee of the Whole and I think that would be the far better procedure.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I did submit an application for a rule and after I submitted my application for the rule, I thought that the matter had been satisfactorily adjusted by conference with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and Dr. Gabrielson.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have accumulated a little file on this matter and it develops ever-increasing interest

as I go along, and for that reason I think an authorization for the expenditure of \$290,000 and the setting up of 30 additional spots with their pay rolls is a matter which might become permanent as we go along and I think is deserving of some debate in the Committee of the Whole. I would much prefer to have the gentleman procure a rule, for I think that is the far better procedure.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think the matter is so important and the explanation that has been given so clear that I cannot agree; I will have to agree, of course, if objection is made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret to press my objection, but I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that I think it ought to be considered in the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BLAND. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia objects.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my objection.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2801, to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as is indicated by the title to the bill, this would give the Secretary of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter.

There can be no question but what the duties of the Secretary of the Interior have increased tremendously in the last few years, but I do not think that this burden has increased in proportion any more than the duties of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, each one of whom has the same number as the Secretary of the Interior now has. Therefore, I object.

MONTEZUMA CASTLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 378, to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the acquisition of a small area of added land to one of our national monuments. The Secretary of the Interior has not recommended the bill, and ordinarily we on this committee would insist that the matter be brought up under a general rule rather than by unanimous consent. However, in view of the fact that the bill is sponsored by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], and in view of the fact that the bill contemplates the expenditure of \$25,000, we have decided to forego our principle and practice and to raise no objection at this time. However, we will offer an amend-

ment to limit the appropriation authorized to \$25,000.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Interior, on behalf of the United States, is authorized to acquire, in his discretion, certain lands located in the State of Arizona known as the Montezuma Well property, containing approximately 180 acres and situated within section 36, township 15 north, range 5 east, and section 31, township 15 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River meridian. Such lands, when acquired, shall become a detached unit of Montezuma Castle National Monument.

(b) Effective on the date of the acquisition of such property, the south half of the north-west quarter of section 31, township 15 north, range 6 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, containing 80 acres of land owned by the United States, shall also become a part of such national monument.

Sec. 2. All laws, rules, and regulations applicable to such national monument shall be applicable with respect to the lands described in the first section of this act upon the addition of such lands to such national monument. The title to real property acquired pursuant to this act shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York:

On page 2, line 16, after the words "as may be necessary", insert a comma and the words and figures "but not to exceed \$25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEEPAGE AND DRAINAGE DAMAGES ON THE ILLINOIS RIVER, ILL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3029, to authorize the adoption of a report relating to seepage and drainage damages on the Illinois River, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following report is hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers:

Illinois River, Ill.; in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 711, Seventy-seventh Congress, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL JEFFERSON BICENTENARY COMMITTEE

The Clerk called the next business, Senate Joint Resolution 47, providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I cannot see the

justice of this bill if we ever expect to do justice to the memory of Thomas Jefferson. While the real Jeffersonian Democrats of America seem to have been asleep, this commission for the alleged anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson erected the most hideous monstrosity with which the memory of a great man has ever been punished in all the tide of time—this so-called Jefferson Memorial down here.

They picked out of the sayings of Thomas Jefferson certain statements, threw them together, mixed them into a conglomeration that makes Thomas Jefferson look like a Communist, just as far from the Jeffersonian philosophy of government as could possibly be. Now, if we are going to do anything else for Thomas Jefferson, for goodness' sake, as a great Englishman once said: "Let's don't add another pang to his death." Let us get somebody besides this group that perpetrated this outrage on the memory of Thomas Jefferson by putting those inscriptions inside the so-called Jefferson Memorial. I invite all decent Americans to go in there and read them, and get the life of Jefferson, get his own words, his own sayings, and then compare them.

Then they will recognize the hideous attempt to distort history by this Commission. Why not put in there the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson as expressed in his first inaugural address, the 16 points which he announced to the world and to posterity which constitute the sum of good government.

I will read from that address, and will take the liberty of numbering those 16 points and set them out by paragraphs. In that, the most historic address of the nineteenth century, Mr. Jefferson said:

About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations.

He then laid down the following 16 points:

First:

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious, or political.

Second:

Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none.

Third:

The support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-Republican tendencies.

Fourth:

The preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad.

Fifth:

A jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of the

revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided.

Sixth:

Absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics from which there is no appeal but to force—the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism.

Seventh:

A well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war till regulars may relieve them.

Eighth:

The supremacy of the civil over the military authority.

Ninth:

Economy in the public expense that labor may be lightly burdened.

Tenth:

The honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith.

Eleventh:

Encouragement of agriculture and of commerce as its handmaid.

Twelfth:

The diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason.

Thirteenth:

Freedom of religion.

Fourteenth:

Freedom of the press.

Fifteenth:

Freedom of person under the protection of habeas corpus.

Sixteenth:

Trial by juries impartially selected. These principles—

He says—

from the bright constellation which has gone before us and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civil instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of terror or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

Why was that not inscribed on the interior of this alleged Jefferson Memorial just as the Gettysburg Address of Lincoln was placed inside the Lincoln Memorial? Why all this conglomeration, why all this distortion of the words of Jefferson? Why all this changing and mixing of phrases and the elimination of statements in order to misrepresent to the children of the coming generations the greatest democratic statesman the world has ever seen?

No; I am not going to agree for this commission—which left these immortal expressions of Jefferson out of the inscriptions on the walls of that memorial—I am not going to agree for that commission to put its hands on the record of Thomas Jefferson again.

I object to this bill in its present form. The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

DAM AND DIKE IN THE NORTH SLOUGH, COOS COUNTY, OREG.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3145, authorizing the construction of a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters in the North Slough in Coos County, Oreg., for the purpose of reclaiming land for farming.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That authority is hereby granted to the State of Oregon, acting through its highway department, and to the North Slough drainage district, organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, to construct, maintain, and operate, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters into North Slough in Coos County, Oregon, in township 24 south, range 13 west, Willamette meridian.

Work shall not be commenced on such dam and dike until the plans therefor, including plans for all accessory works, are submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, who may impose such conditions and stipulations as they deem necessary to protect the interest of the United States.

The authority granted by this act shall terminate if the actual construction of the dam and dike hereby authorized is not commenced within 5 years and completed within 8 years from the date of the passage of this act. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 9 of the act approved August 26, 1937 (heretofore extended by acts of Congress approved July 2, 1940, and September 22, 1941), authorizing the State of Oregon, acting through its highway department, the North Slough drainage district, and the North Slough dike district, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike for preventing the flow of tidal waters into North Slough in Coos County, Oreg., in township 24 south, range 13 west, Willamette meridian, be and is hereby revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this authority shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the dam and dike herein referred to be commenced within 5 years and completed within 8 years from the date of approval hereof.

"Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to revive and reenact section 9 of an act entitled 'An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes,' approved August 26, 1937."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes in reply to the statements by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I shall want 5 minutes in which to reply to the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The Chair reminds the gentlemen that there are other special orders which have already been agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the call of the Consent Calendar. FLAG FOR CERTAIN PERSONS WHO DIE IN THE SERVICE OF THE LAND OR NAVAL FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 800) to provide for the issuance of a flag to the nearest relatives of certain persons who die in service in the land or naval forces of the United States and agree to its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia has the floor, having reserved the right to object.

Mr. BLAND. I have reserved the right to object in order to get an opportunity to speak on the Jefferson bill, to which I think every American is entitled.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a very wide range under a reservation of objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, there are many things about the Jefferson Memorial I did not know about, there are many things that have been done that I do not know anything about and I am not in accord with all that has been done. They may have been right.

But this has nothing to do with this United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, except that it is created, and in cooperation with the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will separate it from this Commission that perpetrated this alleged Jefferson Memorial down here and placed those misleading inscriptions inside it, I shall not object. Jefferson was the greatest promoter of agricultural development of his day and generation. I recognize that fact, and I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. In order that this matter may be understood, this calls for the creation of the National Agricultural Bicentenary Committee for the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of Jefferson's birth and deals with agriculture.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but it is under the supervision of that Commission. It says: "A joint resolution providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson," and so forth. Whoever collected, composed, or compiled those statements inside the Jefferson Me-

morial would not know a cottonstalk from a cocklebur or a buckhead from a clevis. What do they know about agriculture?

Mr. BLAND. I do not know.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman from Virginia will separate it from this Commission and let it be conducted by some real Jeffersonians, Democrats or Republicans, or both, I shall not object, but I am not going to even run the risk of having this crowd distort the record of Thomas Jefferson on agriculture, about which they know nothing. Whoever got up those inscriptions inside that Jefferson Memorial knows absolutely nothing about agriculture.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to restore the bill, S. J. Res. 47, to the calendar and that it may be passed over without objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree to that.

Mr. BLAND. I may say that I am a new member of that committee, and it was brought in for the first time for consideration recently. The chairman is not here, and it occurs to me that we can best meet the objections of the gentleman by having it passed over.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman agree that it go over without prejudice?

Mr. BLAND. Yes; that is what I am asking.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has three pages of whereases. It does not seem to me that it is good practice to write that kind of a bill.

Mr. BLAND. I had some question about that myself when I read those whereases but they seemed to be all right. That will be considered, of course, and the other objections will be considered.

Mr. RANKIN. Do those whereases distort the record of Thomas Jefferson as badly as the inscriptions down here in the Jefferson Memorial?

Mr. BLAND. I have no idea that they do.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the bill being passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a bill. Is there objection?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know anything about this bill. We have had the Consent Calendar under consideration and the gentleman now asks unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill that has not been on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from New Jersey and to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the situation is simply this: The bill provides a flag for those soldiers and sailors whose bodies have not been recovered. Under the law, the War Department or the Navy Department when

they send a soldier's body home send a flag with it. But there are a great many of these boys unfortunately whose bodies are not recovered and this measure authorizes the Veterans' Administration to supply those flags.

Mr. KEAN. They are given to the families?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; they are given to the families. I took this up with the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and they are unanimously for it.

Mr. KEAN. I cannot possibly object to such a bill as this but I want to give notice that when we have the Consent Calendar up for consideration, the bills should be on the Consent Calendar and in the future I am going to object.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey, that if I had not been thoroughly convinced that no Member of the House would object I would not have called the bill up.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman from Mississippi follow the practice of the House which has been announced by the majority and minority leaders and which is generally adhered to, that no bills shall be permitted to come up for consideration until the gentleman expecting to call the bill up has at least conferred with the majority leader?

Mr. RANKIN. I conferred with the Speaker. I also conferred with the majority and minority members of the committee.

Mr. MICHENER. This is just one of those things, a type of bill that no one feels like objecting to. However, the practice is such that it would be ruinous if this general philosophy were followed in calling up bills. The majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], has stated on the floor time and time again, that this practice will not be indulged in. I am just wondering if he was advised that this bill was to be called up in this matter.

Mr. McCormack. The gentleman from Michigan is absolutely correct. I had no knowledge of the bill coming up.

I heard the colloquy. It is usually good practice, as well as courtesy, to consult the leadership on both sides. It is bad practice not to do so. I would suggest to the gentleman from Mississippi that he bring this bill up tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I conferred with the Speaker about this proposition.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker has made the statement from this Chair many times that, after conference with him, any Member intending to take up a matter out of order should confer with both the majority and minority leaders. The gentleman from Mississippi did speak to the Chair about this matter. Not knowing whether or not the gentleman had conferred with the majority and minority leaders, and without questioning him on it this morning, the Chair recognized him. Under the circumstances, the Chair would suggest that the gentleman from Mississippi withdraw his request.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I shall ask permission to call up the bill tomorrow.

Mr. McCormack. That is what I suggested.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his request.

Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PROPOSED FORMATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL BANK

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order to make some observations on proposals for the formation of some kind of a world bank or international financial organization after the war. In this first place I want to say that nothing ought to be done about this matter until the fullest discussion has been had in the Congress.

An international clearing house to facilitate the settlement of balances as between the nations of the world, to be helpful in assisting nations in balancing their exports against their imports and to put international trade on perhaps a more orderly basis than it has been in the past, would be altogether desirable. There are, however, certain dangers in connection with such a proposal that I want to point out, because it appears to me that if any such world bank were to be given the power to dictate to nations as to what policies they must pursue with regard to their domestic money, it would be exercising a power which will prove dangerous both to international peace and to the expansion of production within the nations.

Some of the proposals for a world bank certainly are open to this objection. What could happen under these circumstances is briefly this: It would be possible for the board or controlling agency of such a world bank to say to a certain nation, "We are sorry, but we cannot continue to accommodate you unless you maintain a certain reserve in such and such a precious metal or unless you reduce the volume of your currency," or "We will take these measures which you request if you do pursue a certain policy with regard to the volume of money in circulation in your nation."

This could mean virtually an economic dictatorship in the hands of such a world bank over the economies of the various nations — particularly the financially weaker ones.

I also want to point out that when we talk about tying the currency of one nation to the currency of another nation we seldom, I think, remember that it does not do the least bit of good to tie the value of the dollar, for example, to the pound, or to tie the pound to the dollar, unless the domestic buying powers of both the pound and the dollar have within the British Nation and the American Nation themselves been stabilized. Otherwise the proposition amounts to something like tying a couple of balloons together in the vain hope that you will thereby stabilize the flight of one or the other.

So the fundamental problem that we confront is the problem of securing a stabilization of the purchasing power of money within each nation, and on the

basis of that it becomes possible then to work toward an international stabilization which will be effective.

I do believe, of course, that the granting of credit and the making of loans to certain nations after the war will probably be necessary. I think that if that can be done through some international agency it might be well, provided always, however, that they are not made the means of controlling the domestic economic life of the nations to whom they are made. That is the warning I wanted to sound.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Is the gentleman approaching the suggestion of means whereby stabilization may be effected as to the economies within the respective countries?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I believe it can be done. I have believed it for years. I thank the gentleman for asking that question. It is something about which I have spoken on the floor a good many times, and about which I have written some.

I think it is altogether possible for us to have a scientific monetary system whereby our monetary supply will be expanded in proportion to the expansion of the production of real goods and services, and whereby inflation can be prevented by judicious use of the taxing power. I think with two weapons in the hands of a monetary authority set up by this Congress, namely, first, the exclusive right to create money in this Nation; and, second, the right to recommend to Congress tax measures which would be effective in curbing inflation, you can get a stabilization of the buying power of your money. I think that especially with regard to agriculture there is nothing quite so important from the standpoint of future prosperity.

I want to say a word on another subject if I have time.

We have heard a great deal of opposition expressed to the use of subsidies to keep down the price of farm commodities and food products. I want to say frankly, I think it is true that if we attempt to subsidize the entire Nation to reduce the cost of food to all American citizens by means of the payment of some type of subsidy, we are attempting to lift ourselves by our own bootstraps, and it will not be a counter-inflationary measure, but quite the contrary.

It seems to me there are two problems that we have to confront. One is the problem of having an adequate return to farm producers so as to induce maximum production. Certainly the price that they receive is an important element therein. The second thing is that there are certain people in this Nation to whom the Congress owes a very real and profound obligation, from the standpoint of protecting the buying power of their money. The people that I refer to are, first and most important perhaps, the dependents of men who are now serving the armed forces. We

have passed legislation, inadequate though it be in my judgment, providing a certain number of dollars to the wives and children of men now in the service. We certainly have an obligation to see that the buying power of those dollars is not constantly reduced. We have an obligation not to dilute the buying power of the compensations and pensions being received by war veterans of this country. We have an obligation with regard to every single person who is attempting to get along on an old age pension in the various States.

In addition to that, there are some 21 percent of our population today whose annual earnings are \$1,000 a year or less. It does not seem to me therefore that it is an adequate position for a Member to take, nor one that he can consistently defend, to simply say, "I am against all subsidies," and let it go at that. I think there has to be another answer to this problem. My own feeling about this question would be quite different and much more hopeful if we had established what I have chosen to call "the converse of rationing."

A rationing program was instituted for the purpose of seeing that nobody in the population has more than his share of the supply of scarce commodities, but I believe that in time of war it becomes important that we see to it that a minimum basic standard of living is possible for all our people. I do not believe that by policies that have to be pursued for the sake of securing adequate production for the war, we should deliberately permit a 25-percent reduction to take place in the amount of food that can be bought by some of the groups of people whose income is low and whom I enumerated a moment ago. It therefore seems to me that the right way to use a program of governmental support, if you have to do it, is to spend that money where it is really needed and where it will really do the good and reach the need that exists. We have already had experience with the operation of the stamp plan. We used it before for the purpose of making it possible for farm commodities which we called surpluses—when really they were not from any real, human point of view—but we called them surpluses to enable them to be moved to the people who needed additional food.

The answer to this obligation that I said I believed was ours could be found by means of instituting what has been called in a bill which was introduced in the Senate by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, and in the House by our colleague from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] and myself a national food-allotment plan. Briefly, under this plan, when people whose family income is less than an amount which would enable them to purchase a minimum food-allotment diet as described in this legislation went to their ration board to get their regular ration stamps, they would be able to obtain some supplementary stamps with which they could increase their purchasing power of food, in order to bring up their buying power for food to this minimum national food allotment which is herein described. Under those circumstances, we would

then have protected all of our people, especially the groups I mentioned, against the possibility that where an increase in the price of a farm crop was absolutely necessary in order to cover the cost of production, those people, where it would really hurt them and where they would get less food than they needed, could still be protected and get the food that they needed.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Would that not solve the problem which is now before us, where a certain amount of money is necessary to subsidize the production of butter? We increase the points and thereby prevent them from having it anyway.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that is a very pertinent observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does your bill assume that there is plenty and that the difficulty lies in the lack of purchasing ability?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No, it does not quite assume that there is plenty. I think there are a great many food products where, relative to the present existing demand, there is a real shortage. I do not think we can avoid that. I think that is going to be with us. But I am saying that as to these people who are in a position where their incomes have not been increased at all since the war began, or where they are attempting to get along on these dependency allowances that we provided, or where they are attempting to go along on compensation for disabilities created in previous wars, or where old folks are trying to get along on their old-age pensions, or where there are certain groups of school teachers, white-collar workers, and a good many wage-earners who do not have enough to buy the food they actually need, it seems to me that the minimum necessary to sustain real health and welfare ought to be secured to them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Assuming that I have 54 cents and I want to buy a pound of butter, I can now only get a quarter of a pound of butter. What are we going to do when there is not enough butter in the country and the Government is purchasing too much of it? That is what we are getting so many kicks about. What are we going to do when we have such a tremendous shortage of production?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am not saying that my bill is going to solve the whole problem.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is not the whole purpose of the bill. But I want to be free to do everything within my power to increase production of agricultural commodities.

Sometimes I think an increase in the price is necessary and important in or-

der to do that, but I think it is important likewise for the Congress to be in position where it can say that it is not permitting such price increases to take from any American family the food it needs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman considered the great advisability, to my mind, of having different ration points for butter than for meat? It seems rather illogical to me that we should have to use the same points for butter that we use for meat.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am sorry I do not feel I am competent to answer that question. If my wife were present I am sure she could give the lady from Massachusetts an intelligent answer on that question, but I do not think I should attempt to do so.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know that the gentleman goes into everything very thoroughly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand and I think I see what the gentleman from Massachusetts has in mind. I suppose, however, it is important to keep these things as simple as they can be, and it is complicated at best. That is the only thing I can think of that arises on the other side of the picture, but I will say to the gentleman that I am inclined to agree with her about it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. He is always very fair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I understand correctly, it takes about 4 years to get a milk producer.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If that be correct, is not one of the reasons for this great shortage the fact that we have been killing off our milk cows, getting rid of them?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think we must prevent the slaughtering of any good milk cows whatsoever.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And we will not have butter until that shortage has been met?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The reason goes beyond that; it is the result of a vast increase in the demands for these products, the tremendous increase in the demands for butter; the fact that the American people are consuming vastly more dairy products than they ever did before, together with the demands for our armed services, all this adds up to a far greater increase in demand than our farmers have had to meet ever before, together with the fact that we also have a responsibility to certain people across the water which we did not have before.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is the fundamental reason. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I do not want any policy to be pursued that is going to cut down the supply or result in a de-

crease of production; we have got this responsibility to meet, and I want to preserve every ounce of production possible. I do not want these dairy cows to be taken out of production; I want to stimulate production under present circumstances. I want to have a price policy that will guarantee maximum production, but when I advocate that I do not want to be in position where I can really be charged with having reduced the buying power of some groups of our people below the minimum required to provide a decent living for American families.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by General O'Connor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Gross] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PRISONS A SOURCE OF MANPOWER FOR THE ARMY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, recently there has been a great deal of agitation in the country about the drafting of fathers into the armed forces. I am one of the men who has voted for every dollar the Army and the Navy have asked for, and I would be the last man who would do one thing to hinder the armed forces, because if there is one problem ahead of all others it is to win this war. I am willing to give them just as many men as they need, regardless of where they come from or how badly it hurts; but, after all, there seems to be a question in the minds of a lot of people as to the necessity of some of the things that are being done.

The question has arisen as to why so many men in penal institutions are not used, why all of those men do not find their way into the war effort. Because of that I have recently introduced a bill, H. R. 3202, which provides that before any fathers are inducted into the armed forces, all able-bodied, sound-minded men in the penal institutions should be used in the war effort wherever they might fit. For just a short while today I want to talk about this problem and call to the attention of the House the reaction I have had dealing with this subject.

There is no reason exactly that I can see why the armed forces should not take a lot of men that society must ultimately take. It is true that after a man has served his time the Army takes him. The man serving his time is no worse than the man who has served his time; and those of us who have done the same things but did not get caught are no better than they are. So I cannot see any good reason why sound-minded, able-bodied men should not be used in the armed forces. It simmers down to this: All these men except the lifers in these prisons eventually serve their time or are

paroled regardless of whether they are sound in mind and body or not. Society has got to take even the feeble-minded ones. I do not see why society should have to take a group of men that the Army refuses to take. If there is one place where they can be disciplined, it is in the Army.

I call your attention to certain facts and information which I shall read from an editorial in a publication known as The New Era published at the Leavenworth Federal Prison, Leavenworth, Kans. I quote from the editorial:

Every day and every night the hundreds of radio programs of the Nation repeat one message, over and over, "Forget sectional and personal differences! Banish every custom or prejudice which might hold back the fullest war effort. Let nothing prevent the utilization of every available man, every talent, every skill, every dollar."

And yet, strange as it seems, 200,000 able men, American men, many of them skilled at manning these, or similar, farms and machines, plead for a chance at these jobs now, today—reaching out toward this chance of redemption and their chance of helping America, as a man dying of thirst reaches out toward a water mirage in an agony of hope and in an agony of mentally fighting against the black despair of being held back now—now of all times.

Hundreds of articles have appeared in magazines and recent publications attesting to the patriotic men in institutions. They get very little money for what they do, and yet in every penal institution in the country they are asked to and do buy War bonds. For instance, the inmates of Leavenworth Penitentiary purchased War bonds totaling \$86,025, and they do not get as much per day for their labor as many of us Congressmen spend a day for cigars. Money is donated to service organizations totaling \$3,034.98. One thousand four hundred of the inmates of Leavenworth donated 1,335 pints of blood. Certainly this attests to the patriotic nature of these men. They are not lying down on the job. I quote further:

In proportion to their income, which is barely adequate to supply them with the simplest luxuries such as cigarettes, these prisoners have contributed financially to the war effort through the purchase of bonds to a degree that should shame the civilian. Their record as voluntary blood donors to the Red Cross is a nationally known example of patriotism. The record of the prisoners already accepted into the armed forces is literal and undeniable proof of their Americanism.

All of these agencies have pointed out the fact that these prisoners are going to be released at some future date anyway and have asked "Why not now when conditions for their reform are best and when the Nation's need of their services is greatest?"

The Federal penal rules governing the release of prisoners did not contemplate that America might be drawn into a great war. These rules were made to fit a peacetime economy in which men competed for jobs.

These rules, as they now stand, preclude the release of a prisoner until he has served a certain number of years of his sentence, no matter whether the prisoner is rehabilitated or not.

However much training or skill the man may have acquired, however completely the classification board of the penal institution may have determined that the prisoner is

ready and safe for reentry into society, under these rules he cannot be released until his minimum time, be it 2 or 20 years, has been served.

He goes on in another article written in the Rocky Mountain News to say:

I am in hearty agreement with Lewis E. Lawes, former warden of Sing Sing, in his recommendation that at least 75 percent of the men in America's prisons should be released to fight.

Mr. Lawes says he sometimes thinks there is more patriotism and spirit inside the prisons than outside. Whenever blood donors are asked to volunteer, for example, scores of men in prison step forward. "Just give them a chance to fight for their country, and then get out of the way," he advised.

And that's sound advice.

On my last visit to the State penitentiary with Governor Carr, I found ample proof of the patriotic spirit mentioned by Mr. Lawes.

There has been some effort made to release prisoners and some have gotten into the armed forces and have very good records.

In New Jersey some 400 prisoners have been paroled to go into the service and have been transformed into real fighting men. Only a handful have proved unsuited for military life, none have committed serious infractions, and many have records of conspicuous merit.

It is stated further here that—

The Federal Government is also exploring the possibility of utilizing manpower bottled up in Federal penitentiaries.

Why should the Federal Government be exploring that? The President has authority to order your son or my son or you or I into the service. Why should not the President issue a proclamation that these men of sound mind and able bodies be used in the armed forces where they can serve?

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman know that the Federal Bureau of Prisons under the direction of James Bennett is exploring this matter, that prisoners from our Federal prisons have gone into the armed service, that this exploration to which the gentleman refers is already under way and has been for a long, long time? Does the gentleman's bill provide for the release of all prisoners to go into the armed service?

Mr. GROSS. It provides that those of sound mind and able body up to the age of 45 may be taken into the service.

Mr. STEFAN. Do they have to pass an examination under a psychiatrist or a doctor?

Mr. GROSS. "Sound mind," of course, would imply that.

Mr. STEFAN. Is that the only qualification, just sound mind?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. STEFAN. It is a fact that prisoners have been released who have had sound minds and they have committed terrible crimes upon society through the parole system sometimes. The parole system itself is being explored. I may say to the gentleman that I happen to be a member of the Committee on Ap-

appropriations that makes the appropriations for Federal prisons.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will find some very illuminating information if he will refer to the proceedings of that committee.

Mr. GROSS. The fact is that the red tape connected with it has kept men back and that what it needs is streamlining. This matter of exploring, exploring and investigating in an emergency is one of the things that the country is sick and tired of.

It is stated here further:

Those favoring release of inmates for war effort point out that 96 percent of them will come out eventually. Now, they contend, is the ideal time, as there is plenty to keep them occupied.

That is taken from the Christian Science Monitor of April 6, 1943.

Now, I want to call attention to some reaction I have received. I have here a communication signed by Dutton S. Peterson, of the joint legislative committee of the State of New York, to study the use of New York State prisoners in war service. That committee has made a study of this and here is what he writes:

Your proposal that no pre-Pearl Harbor fathers be inducted until all convicts between the ages of 18 and 45 and physically fit are inducted is interesting.

I feel confident that some type of Federal legislation might help the situation. Of course various Federal agencies are working at the problem with varying results in different States.

The recently established special selective-service panels in the prisons are making little progress, in fact seem to be retarding Army inductions. I have reports from many States relative to this difficulty.

In their report they go on to say:

1. Within a radius of 50 miles of Elmira Reformatory an estimated 25-30 percent of hay is still standing in the fields unharvested due to lack of help.

2. Within one-half mile of Elmira Reformatory the Elmira Foundry Co., a General Electric affiliate, engaged wholly in war production of the most critical kind, is seriously hampered by lack of common laborers. Delivery of orders is delayed and additional orders refused because of this shortage of unskilled labor. Twenty men working in the yard would speed the work of hundreds in the production of critical war material.

Certainly there is a place where a lot of these men could be used. They go on to say that induction is slow and cumbersome and needs streamlining.

Let me quote some of the things I have clipped from newspapers recently in connection with this problem. Just a week or so ago there appeared an Associated Press report, reading like this:

Prisoners at Western State Penitentiary heard themselves praised yesterday by Lewis E. Lawes, former warden at Sing Sing, for their outstanding service to the Nation through production for the war effort.

More than 1,000 inmates gathered on the prison athletic field and saw a Navy color guard run up a production pennant within the walled areas. They had earned it by fulfilling Navy, Army, and Coast Guard con-

tracts in the prison's metalworking and textile shops.

Warden S. P. Ashe announced that the prisoners had bought \$12,455.75 worth of War bonds in the Third War Loan, almost quadrupling their quota of \$3,378.

May I say that I am mighty happy to report that while some judges throughout the country have not expressed themselves about this thing, certain other judges are in a great many cases giving men suspended sentences if they will present themselves for induction. In my county—York County—Judge Sherwood and Judge Anderson have recently suspended the sentences in the case of nine men if they would promise to present themselves for induction into the armed service. Seven of them have passed the examination and are now in the armed forces. Evidently this thing is taking hold throughout the country and the judges are going to get as many men into the armed forces as they can in preference to seeing them go to prison.

It is a fact that some fellows have simply committed a trivial offense and they could thereby escape getting into the armed forces. I have before me an Associated Press report where a man over at Philadelphia, who has a very excellent record in the marines, is now on probation and consequently cannot get into the armed forces. The thing he was charged with was slapping a nurse on the back at Jefferson Hospital in Philadelphia. He said he did it as a joke; he thought it was a lot of fun; but they picked him up, took him before an alderman, who gave him a suspended sentence. Here is a good, old-time marine who will not be taken by the marines, the Army, or Navy because he slapped a nurse on the back.

It is too ridiculous for us to talk about when you are thinking about taking a man with half a dozen children and putting him in the armed forces, when the Army will not take a man because he slapped a nurse on the back to give her a laugh.

We can go on down the line and mention numerous cases. Let me call your attention to some of the response that has come from people around the country. For instance, here is a letter from California. It states:

This is just to tell you that I believe that your bill providing that no pre-Pearl Harbor fathers be inducted until all convicts between the ages of 18 and 45, and physically fit, have been drafted, is a good thing, and I surely trust that it will go through.

Then I have a letter here signed by Neil S. Bishop, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the Maine Legislature. He is heartily in support of this movement. He says:

More power to you.

He goes on to say that he has for a long time been hoping that something along this line would be done. This only goes to show that men in public life are thinking about it.

You may wonder what the prisoners think about it. I have here a letter from a prisoner, inmate 16790, by the name of John B. Suttle, in the Oregon State

Prison, in which he says that he has given his blood right along, he has bought his bonds, and he is willing to serve in the armed forces any place that he can serve.

I have a number of other letters. Here is one from the Illinois State Penitentiary, from Convict Warren Wilcoxon, register No. 16023. He says:

I have pleaded and demanded a chance to show my Americanism and my willingness, yes, eagerness to fight for the land that my forefathers fought and died for. Am I to be deprived of this chance because I have violated one of man-made laws? Who, if not I and my kind, are more capable of slinking through the jungles taking pot shots at the ones that have become so egotistical that they think they can invade our soil?

I am writing you this to tell you you have not the slightest idea of the feelings of a con toward all isms but one, Americanism.

He goes on to say that all he wants is an opportunity.

Here is another one signed by Henry Shepperd, register No. 16998, from the Illinois State Penitentiary, which has just about the same story, pleading for an opportunity to fight and to prove himself.

I have here another one from Elmer Whited, register No. 17852, in which he pleads for an opportunity to fight for God's country and to reinstate himself.

I have two other letters from inmates of the Illinois State Penitentiary similarly pleading for an opportunity.

Here are some cards I have received. These are all written in good handwriting, better than the average man writes. These are from the Kentucky State Prison. This man's name is Finley Duncan, convict No. 35173. He says that he is 30 years of age and would like to get into the armed forces and serve his country.

I have another one here from a young man who says:

I am 32 years old. That is a fine bill and we all would like to do our part in the armed forces.

Here is another card from the La Grange Penitentiary. He says:

I am a prisoner in this institution, serving an 8-year sentence for robbery. I possess a clean past record, and I am fully qualified to serve these United States as only a true American can. I am 25 years old.

Can you imagine a man who has committed one crime of larceny being in the pen for 8 years at a time like this, when maybe just when the war is over he will have served his 8 years, so that when he goes out society will have to take him; yet today the Army refuses to take him? After all, whether or not they make good soldiers, if they cannot be handled in the Army where will they ever be handled?

Here is another card from a convict named Clarence B. Young, No. 29799. He says:

I have just read in the paper your opinion on drafting pre-Pearl Harbor fathers. I think it is a good idea to draft all convicts that are able-bodied. We will be watching the outcome of your bill and hoping that we will have a chance to help lick the enemy.

These are written in good handwritings, better than half of us Congressmen write.

Here is another one from the penitentiary signed by Manon Dixon, convict No. 33342. He says:

I would appreciate the opportunity to help win this war.

So it goes on. I have a lot more mail in the office. I am not pleading to keep fathers home if we need them, but to give these men an opportunity. The prisons are overcrowded. They are more of a public burden than most people realize. Here will be an opportunity to give a lot of men a chance to prove themselves. If they come out of the Army with a good record, with an honorable discharge, I see no reason why they should not be released. If they come out of the Army and do not have an honorable discharge, certainly they should go back and serve out their time. I believe this is something worthy of consideration.

I have not received a single letter nor have I had a single comment in opposition to this kind of thing. I hope the Military Affairs Committee of the House will, at an early date, take action on this bill to help these men to find their places, and thus relieve many fathers from duty, and permit these men to find their places in the armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] be permitted to extend his remarks by including a letter written by one of his constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

UNPROVED RAYON THEORY THREATENS COTTON—GRANT OF REQUEST FOR EXPANSION OF RAYON PLANTS TO MAKE RAYON CORD FOR TIRES WOULD STRIKE SEVERE BLOW AT THE COTTON FARMER

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, if a certain request now pending before the War Production Board is granted it may, and probably will, have the ultimate effect of doing irreparable harm to the cotton farmer and to the economic structure of the South. I refer to the pending application of the War Department for certain priorities and permission to expand and convert additional facilities to the manufacture of rayon cord to be used in synthetic tires to take the place of cotton cord that has always been used for that purpose.

So serious and so dangerous is this threat that the Truman Special Investigating Committee of the United States Senate spent several months in an ex-

tensive study and investigation of the subject. The committee filed a report on July 16, 1943, strongly urging the W. P. B. to defer the application in view of existing evidence, and concluded with the warning that if the program of conversion is carried out the South will lose about 10 percent of its normal domestic market for cotton.

It follows that the subject is of profound importance to the cotton farmer and to the economic structure of the Southland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the facts behind this proposal? There has already been an expansion, under high priorities, of facilities in existing rayon plants sufficient to provide rayon cord for 97,000,000 pounds of synthetic rubber. I am addressing my remarks now to a request that is now pending calling for the building of new and additional facilities that would provide rayon cord for an additional 100,000,000 pounds.

In view of the fact that this expansion and conversion program so seriously affects the cotton industry, which is one of this Nation's greatest enterprises, it follows that the change certainly cannot be justified unless it is made perfectly clear by thorough tests that the rayon cord is, in fact, superior to the cotton cord and that the change would be to the best interest of the war program.

TRUMAN COMMITTEE REPORT SAYS RAYON EXPANSION NOT JUSTIFIED

I have already spoken of the Truman report. At this point I should like to quote from the conclusions contained in that document:

1. The committee is convinced and strongly urges that further expansion of rayon-cord facilities, now recommended by the Rubber Director and approved in part by the War Production Board, be deferred until proper and complete tests of a standard which has not been met by tests to date will indicate with a reasonable degree of certainty whether or not further use of rayon cord will aid the war effort.

2. The tests conducted by the War Department failed to indicate superiority for rayon tire cord in the tire sizes for which the bulk of the new expansion would be used.

3. Expansion of rayon facilities would use large amounts of materials sorely needed by vital war industries. The strong profit possibilities to chemical companies generally, and war-expanded producers of cellulose in particular, should not be overlooked. Against this should be balanced the heavy damage to the economy of a large section of the United States. These considerations weigh heavily in any appraisal of contentions that rayon capacity should now be increased as insurance against the possibility that rayon may some day be proven superior to cotton. There is today under construction sufficient capacity for such insurance.

And the report contains this further significant statement:

The effect of the War Department predilection for rayon, whatever the merits of the controversy, will be a disaster to the post-war economy of the South—loss of 10 percent of the domestic cotton market.

COTTON-CORD QUALITY BEEN PROVEN

The four major rubber companies in this country have to some extent for some time been promoting the conversion from cotton cord to high-tensile

rayon. This was true before the war began, but the difficulty of the proposed conversion has been aggravated by the fact that the cotton cord for that purpose is from 25 to 50 percent less expensive than is rayon cord. During peacetime at least one of the big tire companies manufactured some premium rayon-cord tires. But at the same time that was being done, some independent concerns, who did much research in the uses of cotton cord, were able to compete with the rayon products on a mileage-guaranty basis. Therefore, up until the synthetic program got under way, cotton had held its own in the research laboratories as well as on the highways of this country. And since the wartime synthetic program was begun, the alleged superiority of rayon cord over cotton has not been proven or demonstrated by fair and convincing tests.

Mr. Speaker, the cotton cord used with natural rubber has been tested and its quality has been proven. Great advancement in the lasting qualities of tires using cotton cord has taken place in recent years. Prior to the war, cotton-cord capacity was more than 400,000,000 pounds, amounting to 96 percent of tire production in this country. As I have said, it was far less expensive to use. Moreover, each pound of rayon cord twisted requires machinery that could twist 1.7 pounds of cotton cord, and this advantage of cotton over rayon has been, and still is, an important factor, as the Truman report has pointed out.

But now we find the big tire companies and their associated rayon manufacturers are urging and advertising the added advantages of rayon-cord in tires. It has been pointed out that the rayon expansion program has to date been conducted in part on a basis of certificates of war necessity, and this will enable new facilities to be amortized for tax purposes, over a period of 5 years or the duration, whichever is shorter. The Truman committee shows that in part this is financed by the Defense Plant Corporation. At the end of the war, plants will have been built in which the big tire companies will have little or no investment. This fact may enable rayon-cord prices to be on an equality with the prices of cotton-cord tires.

TESTS REFUTE CLAIM OF RAYON SUPERIORITY

It is true that certain tests have been made upon which the War Department based its opinion that the superiority of rayon-tire cord was proven. But the Truman committee has exposed obvious flaws in the method and system employed in making those tests. The tests were under the supervision of men formerly connected with different major tire companies, and the personnel of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. actually conducted the tests.

In this connection and as bearing on the conclusiveness of these tests, in October and November of 1942, medium-size truck tires were tested and cotton there proved superior to rayon in natural rubber tires for military purposes, and other tests applied to synthetic tires have not supported the claim of rayon

superiority. After considerable controversy had arisen on the subject, Mr. Jeffers last fall appointed an independent tire-testing expert, C. R. Smith, of Sears, Roebuck & Co., to investigate the fairness of the tire-cord tests involved. After 6 weeks of intensive study and observation, Mr. Smith reported that the tests, upon which the War Department relied heavily, were incapable of producing accurate or reliable results. He recommended a fair and accurate method of testing that would remove any doubt as to the respective superiority of the two fabrics. The Truman committee has joined in that request.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the taxpayers are entitled to have a most thorough and complete test made before added expenditures are authorized for rayon expansion and before highly strategic war materials are diverted to this expanded program. The results of the outcome of this issue are of far-reaching importance. The cotton farmer and the cotton industry have a tremendous stake in the outcome. The burden is on the proponents of the proposal to change from cotton to rayon to prove their case before any agency of this Government should become a party to a program that would take from the cotton farmer 10 percent of his normal domestic market. Every reasonable doubt should be resolved in favor of the use of cotton cord. The cotton farmer and the cotton industry and all they mean to the economic life of the South and to the Nation are entitled to that simple consideration at the hands of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NEWSPAPER WEEK

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, Newspaper Week is being celebrated throughout the United States this week, approximately the two hundred and fifty-third anniversary of the founding of the first American newspaper. This country's first news sheet, called *Public Occurrences Both Foreign and Domestick* by its owner and publisher, Benjamin Harris, appeared in Boston in 1690. The first issue was printed on three pages of a folded sheet, leaving the last page blank, and was to be circulated about the county once a month. The aims of *Public Occurrences*, as stated by Harris in the maiden issue, were to make known "such considerable things as have arrived unto our notice," and to take steps toward "curing or at least charming that spirit of lying which prevails among us." Harris also promised that "nothing shall be entered herein but what we have reason to believe is true, repairing to the best fountains for our information," and added his willingness to "expose the names of such persons as are malicious raisers of false reports."

In the 2 days of its existence, *Public Occurrences* informed its readers that the Christianized Indians in Plymouth had appointed a day of thanksgiving, that two children had been stolen by Indians from the settlement of Chelms-

ford, that the smallpox was abating in Boston, and that there had been two fires in the vicinity. Also included among the "occurrences" was the news which proved to be Harris' undoing, a report of the expedition against the French and the use of the friendly Maquas Indians in the battles. His account of the savage treatment of French prisoners by the Indians was extremely displeasing to the authorities, even though the stout old man was speaking for the side of humanity and progress.

Several days later the legislative authorities officially forbade the printing of anything without a governmental license, which Harris did not have and could not get. For at this time the right to regulate the press had been granted in their instructions to each of the colonial governors.

Thus perished the infant publication, the sole point of contact between the great mass of people in America—a vast majority of whom did not even know of the existence of Benjamin Harris—and what we now call public opinion. This act of suppression of the first paper aroused no protest from the humble first settlers—the records, in fact, indicate that the suppression was regarded with a complacency tantamount to approval.

For that little Boston community had not, even as the world had not, yet grown to realize that freedom and liberty of conscience cannot be generally or individually obtained without freedom of opinion and discussion. Harris, in his *Public Occurrences*, was alone in protesting against conditions of his day as opposed to affairs as they should ideally be. He stands out individually as the personification of democracy, of rule of, for, and by the people through public opinion.

He represented the democratic ideal, the theory of public rights, and when he attempted to materialize his ideal through the medium of the yet young printing press, he was suppressed. And as he was alone in his ideals and the upholding of them through actual practice, so was he alone in his protestations against this governmental check. For in the midst of his colony founded on the idea of public rights and liberty, its citizens failed to recognize that within themselves they were creating an autocracy just as binding and hateful as the one from which they had escaped across the ocean. And they were silent and approving as the Governor tied and crushed Harris and his dream. They were as silent then as they are today.

But, like other colonial and revolutionary casualties, it is today easily and glibly said that *Public Occurrences*, the materialization of the democratic ideal, did not die in vain nor will it today. Today the journalistic system has slowly evolved to a point where the people of America are given the fullest measure of control of their existence through the public newspapers. They have come into direct sponsorship of the Government in their representation by the press. Every section and group of individual citizens has a delegate and trustee to his Government in the form of his daily

news sheet, battling for his share of attention and consideration in a democracy where the will of the people is reputedly the law of the land, however, since the invasion of the field of the press by the O. W. I., it is questionable whether this principle is still the law of the land.

The journalistic profession, in its high regard for the simple truth, completes the most competent circle of delegation of power and return that has ever existed. It has devised its own responsive and elastic system of checks. It keeps its avenues for complaints wide open. The continued support of its readers through the years is the only real proof of whether any news organ has achieved its high aims. The existence of the newspaper depends upon its service of that incomprehensible thing, the public. For the democratic citizens are, and must be, free to choose the media through which they wish to be expressed and through which they gain their information. The people have tried out their papers and in them, and in the men who bring the news into being, America is trusting and confident.

Extreme indifference on the part of the American people of the usurpation of their rights might again find us confronted with a situation such as Harris found in 1690. My recommendation to the Congress is to abolish the O. W. I., and turn over to an American unstrangled press, where it rightfully belongs, the handling of the news. During this newspaper week the Congress should resolve to take the shackles off the American press and that America shall be told what they want to know, and that is the truth of what is happening.

Over the years the American press has given a magnificent performance and they deserve our heartfelt thanks rather than the shabby treatment now being dished to them by so-called brilliant intellectuals of the O. W. I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CHEATING THE NAVY OF PLANES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from yesterday's *Washington Post*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the *Washington Post* of yesterday, on page 3-B, Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, wife of the publisher and owner of the *Washington Post*, paints a picture that is, to say the least, very startling. But there is not anything new in what she writes. Months ago people who knew about the situation which confronts the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, about which she writes, were here in Washington, and they told of the situation which then existed in this plant, which was one which prevented production.

The facts were given to the Navy, or, more accurately, in the first instance to the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman Vinson, of the House Committee on Naval

Affairs, to whom I wrote on the 9th of February last. I myself presented them to the officer sent up by the Navy, who had his office in the old House Office Building. They made an investigation. They found the facts to be as presented to them. They did nothing about it.

The only purpose of putting this article into the RECORD now is because of the source from which it comes. Patriotic Americans, a hundred of them or a thousand of them might speak on the same situation and call attention to the remedy, and the Washington Post would not pay any attention to it nor would people generally. But the wife of the publisher and editor goes up there, as she has gone to other plants, and then we get it in the press. We get publicity on it. Let us hope that something comes of it.

In printing this story, the Post is rendering a patriotic service. My only regret is that it did not print the truth about the situation back in the early days of 1943—yes, and prior to that date. As far back as 1939, from the well of the House, attention was called to the situation at Detroit, where the C. I. O. for 42 days, held up production of materials for the Navy and denied the Navy's request for the return of its own patterns and plans.

All that went into the RECORD, verified as it was by a letter from Acting Secretary of the Navy Edison. It was all glossed over. My statement made on the floor of the House was regarded as just a few more idle words from one who was falsely characterized as a labor-baiter.

Now the Navy—yes and the Army and the War Production Board—is reaping the benefit of its own indifference, its own neglect, its own surrender to the labor politicians.

But the Washington Post should not complain. It and the New Deal, which it has supported in season and out, day and night, while the foundations have been laid for what she pictures here, has furnished the canvas, the paint, and the brushes—has furnished everything which finally brought about this situation.

Now, she talks with this union leader and she quotes him in this way:

He, De Lorenzo, the head of the C. I. O., is speaking. Listen to this quotation from him:

Our policy is not to win the war at any cost.

The policy of this great union, whose activity, according to Mrs. Meyer, has resulted in the loss of 65 planes—they are short 65 planes because of strikes—with the resulting stoppage of work, since May 31, 1942. Their policy is not to win the war; they do not intend to win the war, so they say; they do not intend to get out the planes; at least, that is what they say, speaking through their leadership, if they must sacrifice any of their union rights to do it.

With De Lorenzo the labor union comes first—before the United States of America. Putting it another way, John Jones, a member of the union, does not propose that John Smith who joined the union after he did, shall work over in that corner of the plant, if he is in position to do it, even though plane produc-

tion is stopped when John Jones has been a member of the union longer than John Smith.

That statement is not made by a Republican Congressman. That statement is not made by a Member of the House of Representatives. That statement, according to the wife of the publisher of the Washington Post, was made by the union leader.

Men who were members of the Coast Guard Reserve, but who were also members of the union; men who by their oath pledged allegiance to the Government of the United States, disregarded their sworn duty, followed the orders of the union when those orders ran contrary to the orders given by the Navy.

The Navy caused them to be arrested. They were thrown in the brig. They were tried. They were convicted of violating the orders given by their superior officers in the Navy and they were sentenced to prison. But a high administration official, whether in the Navy I do not know, commuted the sentences and the men were given back their jobs. That information comes from the daily press. It has not been denied by the naval authorities. So far, it stands uncontradicted.

The men in the Solomons, on the other war fronts, who are in the Navy, accept the orders of their superiors, even though it may mean death to them. But here in Philadelphia, safe and secure in their homes, with jobs paying top wages, these union men, although they were in the service of the Government, took—perhaps because they were forced to do so—the orders of the union boss, defied Uncle Sam in time of war and, when convicted of such disobedience of orders, were, by the politicians of this administration—and do not forget that Franklin Delano Roosevelt is Commander in Chief of the Navy and gives the orders—permitted to escape punishment; were actually rewarded for disobedience.

If that sort of procedure does not tend to undermine the morale of our men in the armed service, can you tell me what would? Does not that sort of procedure come under the definition of sedition? Where is Prosecutor Maloney and his grand jury?

I suggest that you read this article. It comes from an administration supporter; it comes from one of the newspapers which, for the last 8 years, come hell or high water, has supported the New Deal philosophy, the New Deal's policies. Now they find out what they have been hatching; they are getting the crop from the seed they have been sowing; they find what they have been working to produce, and they have it here in an organization which says, "We will win the war, but we will not win the war if winning the war requires us to let go of any of our union rules and regulations."

Now let me read to you from the other side of this page, where we see some of the reasons why union men were discharged and why production was stopped.

On June 24, 25, and 26 a stoppage occurred at Johnsville because the company

dismissed for loafing and refusing to work, three women, which they had a perfect right to do. And in protest the union called a strike.

In this article Mrs. Meyer places a large part of the blame on the management, forgetting that the Washington Post has supported the administration throughout in its determination and in the policy which it has followed of changing the management of the Brewster Aeronautical Co. The management in that company is the management selected by the Navy and the boards of the administration, and yet she comes along and says that the fault, a large part of it, rests upon the management.

The management which Mrs. Meyer blames is the management given to the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation by this administration itself. When the first labor dispute arose, the administration took the side of the union leaders and, because the company would not yield to the union's demand that it—the union—be given the controlling voice in the operation of the plant, the management of the corporation was fired and a new management, selected by the Navy, or perhaps more accurately, by the administration, was placed in charge.

From that day to this, this administration has been responsible for the management of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation; it has been responsible for its failures, because it has never supported the management when a controversy arose between management and labor.

Let us take courage from the fact that the Post, evidently following the lead of the Philadelphia papers, has decided to throw a little light on the situation which exists in this great plant.

The management discharged these women for loafing. They were not working; they were drawing their wages; they were hindering production; they were refusing to produce, as were others. Then what happened? The union called and kept in force the strike which further hindered production. No one would believe this story if I had written it, but here is a statement of a labor representative, the head of the union, Tom De Lorenzo. And here is an administration paper, you might say, which says he made that statement. Now, talk about seditionists, talk about the activities of the so-called seditionists and the thirty-three-odd who have been referred to as seditionists who have been indicted, but what about the 21,000 workers up here who Mrs. Meyer says, in this article, were hindering production and would not continue production—could not continue, because of the orders of Tom De Lorenzo—if it interfered in any way with the members of "my—his—organization."

One of the men who refused to go out, who was fired by the union—and there was no court procedure, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, no court procedure; the union held its own court, a kangaroo court; no law, no justice, and they disciplined this man; he was a man charged with watching a flyer who was then in the air, who had a pilot in the

air, because he said, "I am not going to go off the job until my man lands; I cannot do otherwise."

So the union fired or disciplined him. The writer of this article, at another point, calls attention to what happened when she states:

Thirteen people were variously punished for not quitting at once when the stoppage was called. Among them was George Stano, a flight inspector, who had a plane in the air. He refused to desert his responsibility until the plane returned. Before the Board he said in strong language that he could not leave his pilot in the air. Therefore, he was cited for using language not becoming to brother workers, and suspended for 30 days without pay, although he is an irreplaceable man.

In conclusion the article states:

This whole history illustrates what I saw all through the country during my 3 months' tour of our war centers. * * *

But today too many of our highest business and industrial executives are the easy-going descendants of their rugged forebears. They have to compete with a labor leadership that has achieved its position by sheer personal merit.

Are we all to be called upon to sacrifice, to spend, and to do without in order to win the war and then have the administration give support to, as it has, as it does, and as it will continue to do—to these union leaders who say: "You shall not have planes unless you comply with what I request"? I ask you in all sincerity, if a year ago I had said outside of this Hall that the Army and the Navy should not have planes, should not have guns, unless they complied with certain requests that I named, how long would it have taken Brother William Powers Maloney and his grand jury down here to have indicted me for sedition? Is not Tom De Lorenzo doing more to decrease production of planes needed by the armed forces, doing more to depress our fighting men and our people when he says we will not get planes, when he says we will get them the union way or not at all, than anything or all the whole 33 indicted ever did?

If our leaders in business and in industry appear now to be easygoing, as Agnes Meyer reports, in my judgment it is not due to any fault on their part but to the realization that, if they assert their independence; if they follow the method which will give our country needed production of war materials; if they are efficient; if their policy or their methods run counter to the interests of the labor politicians, the strong arm of the administration will force them into the way, make them travel the road, which the labor politicians desire.

That has been shown time and again. All too often in the past, when ambitious labor leaders, anxious to establish and to maintain their power, made un-American demands upon management, followed lawless methods, this administration, on the order of the President himself, has taken over private industry, put it under Government operation, given the union leaders what they demanded, and, in practically every instance, lessened production and increased the cost to the taxpayer.

Illustration after illustration might be cited. One of the most outrageous was that when the Government took over the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad.

The administration has been, and it is, playing politics with certain labor leaders. It is directly responsible for the chaos at Brewster. In return for the mess which it has made of things, for the special privileges which it has granted to certain favored labor leaders, they now announce their support of the fourth term.

Glad, indeed, may loyal, patriotic Americans be that the Washington Post at last is beginning to realize the kind of a harvest which the American people will be forced to reap from the seeds which it assisted this administration in sowing.

At last, from a great publication which, through thick and thin, has consistently supported the New Deal, we have a story which shows beyond controversy that at least one policy of this administration is hindering a more efficient prosecution of the war. The administration seems to be more intent on maintaining its political fences than it is in the volume and the quality of the production of planes.

Because the article in the Post comes from a source which can under no circumstances be charged with being either antiadministration or antilabor; because it is so factual, so revealing, and because it so clearly, in spite of the writer's apparent admiration for Mr. De Lorenzo, sets forth the vicious, unpatriotic, and un-American tactics of Mr. Tom De Lorenzo and leaders who share his views it is printed as a part hereof:

CHAOS AND TYRANNY COMPETE BITTERLY AT BREWSTER PLANT—INCOMPETENT MANAGEMENT IS HOPELESSLY ENSNARED BY SHREWED, RUTHLESS UNION AUTOCRATS

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

As the management-labor relations of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation and its failure to get production have become notorious throughout the Nation, I was reckless enough to inject myself into this hurly-burly for a solid week of intensive investigation.

After interviews with labor leaders and management at the Long Island City and Newark plants, I went through the Johnsville plant, just 12 miles north of the Philadelphia line, which was made famous by the guard strike.

Never did I expect to see in America such a picture of managerial chaos, such a complete break-down of worker morale, as this factory presents.

Right and left were men and women idling, laughing, talking, or just sitting inert at empty benches. Some work was going on here and there in a half-hearted kind of way. Three women sitting under semicompleted fuselages made a pretense of activity when I strolled by with a member of the managerial staff. But such concessions to supervisory authority were rare. When one girl was reproved by her foreman for taking time off to make up her face on the assembly line, she looked up calmly and asked, "So what?"

WHAT DO WE CARE?

The toilets are frequented by people taking a smoke, and when Mr. Steele, factory superintendent, who is popular with the rank and file, tried on one occasion to eject them and introduce a semblance of discipline two of the workers replied, "All right, take our numbers. What do we care?"

A similar state of things already had been described to me by workers and management

alike at the Long Island City and Newark plants. But to see it for one's self is to realize that even though such a production fiasco is not typical of industry throughout the Nation something is radically wrong in our country when even one such instance can occur.

Only once before have I witnessed such a total break-down of management and worker morale. It was in Paris under the Blum regime when that friend of the workers had given the labor unions the green light.

Exactly the same sabotage of our war effort—the same kind of break-down which in France was the prelude to defeat—is taking place in the Brewster factories.

Who is to blame? An objective study of the conditions in these plants and of their origin is important, not only because of the critical nature of this one situation but because of the light it throws upon some of our most fundamental problems in labor relations.

COMPANY HISTORY

The Brewster Co. was organized in 1932 by James Work on a shoestring. Prior to 1938 the company operated only in Long Island City, manufacturing airplanes and parts with 500 employees. In 1937 the plant was unionized by the U. A. W.-C. I. O., as Local 365, the contract providing that all future plants should be under the same jurisdiction. Mr. Work granted the union shop and anything else the union leadership demanded in exchange for a low wage scale.

The union leaders accepted low pay rates because they felt confident they could attend to those later, under contractual provisions that are now recognized by all labor-relations experts as among the most restrictive that can be found in the U. A. W.-C. I. O. today.

The company's growth began in 1939 when foreign orders came in. That year a second plant was opened in Newark, N. J., and in 1941 the third one was opened at Johnsville, Pa. Today the company employs 21,000 people, but at no time has production been satisfactory.

As one Navy man put it: "They never had any real production at Brewster, and what they did produce wasn't any good."

The British contracts were canceled last week. The remaining orders are principally for the Navy which, inclusive of the British, amounted to \$250,000,000.

So alarming was the situation in April 1942, that the Navy took over the plants and properties by Executive order of the President and turned them back in May of the same year, under new directors and a new management headed by C. A. Van Dusen, a man of reputation in the airplane field, who lasted for a year without achieving any improvement in production.

MORE STALLING

Van Dusen was convinced that no progress in efficiency could be made under the present contract, which expired in January, 1943. He began negotiations with the union committee that went on for months without final agreement. When certain clauses were settled to mutual satisfaction, the union negotiating committees said that before submitting the case to the War Labor Board, they would have to submit the agreements to their membership.

After a month's delay, they reported that the members had rejected the clauses agreed upon.

The union vote is a farce, as later statements by the workers will prove; this whole technique of stalling and wearing out the management's patience is used by Local 365 in large as in small matters.

When Fred Riebel, now the president of the company, continued the negotiations for a new contract, the same performance took place all over again.

The expired contract is still recognized by both parties for lack of a new one. "Van Dusen was broken trying to get a new contract," said one of the men who had worked with him. "He refused to go into the shop because it simply meant an incessant bombardment of trouble."

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE

What kind of trouble? Instead of repeating hearsay, I shall begin by describing the complex nature of these incessant shop upheavals with my own personal experience.

Last Tuesday as I was sitting in the office of Marco Cicala, vice president of Local 365, the telephone rang. Cicala went to town in no uncertain way.

"Don't you know you can't make changes without consulting our shop committee?" he snapped over the wire. "Say, listen, George, ye're talkin' to Marco."

The conversation was ended. "Whom are you dusting off in that fashion?" I ventured. It was George Schwobel, plant manager of the Long Island City factory, one of the highest executives of the company.

THE ARGUMENT

The argument was this. The company had engaged MacDonald Bros., nationally known engineering experts, to establish a method of reporting production with a view to encouraging greater efficiency. For 3 weeks, after Mr. Schwobel had consulted the union stewards in this department, the group leaders in certain sections of the wing department, Ford Building, had furnished time recorders with the starting and finishing time of jobs.

During these 3 weeks with the same manpower and equipment, merely by keeping records, average production had been raised from 15 to 21 spars, or approximately 40 percent.

The night before, Al Nash, a "B" assembler under the group leaders, but their superior in his capacity as chief union steward of the wing department, had arbitrarily ordered the men to discontinue the timekeeping in spite of its beneficial effects on production.

In order to be sure the management was accurate in its description of events, I asked to be present while Al Nash was questioned by President Riebel. Asked if he had ordered the men to stop, he replied he "had merely told them it was O. K. not to do it, because they did not like the procedure."

Asked whether he would agree to stop interfering with management orders, he said he would agree to nothing until he had consulted the shop committee, and the fact that he was interfering with production made no difference. "The men were objecting violently to the time study," he added, "feeling the company is checking up on them. They are getting resentful and suspicious, which will tend to affect production." Thereupon Riebel fired Nash and a shop committee management meeting had to be called at once. Both parties sent hot telegrams to the War Labor Board for its decision on this minor item of shop routine.

Now the staggering point about this debate is that Al Nash was within his rights according to the prevailing contract, because the management had consulted only the shop stewards before making an innovation and not the whole shop committee.

OBSTRUCTIVE TACTICS

The incident illustrated for me what Fred Riebel, appointed by the Navy in March to succeed Van Dusen as president, had said about the contract:

"If it is strictly invoked by labor, management has no prerogatives. It cannot hire or transfer men, change shifts, use discipline, or do anything else without the O. K. of the shop committee, and every single move involves such lengthy arguments that thousands of man-hours are lost over the slightest move the management tries to make. The

union leaders can do as they please, how, when, and where."

Such purely obstructive tactics are daily occurrences and appear to be flagrant exhibitions of union domination. At Johnsville recently a worker hit a company foreman over the head with a chair, wounding him in the face. Before the company could dismiss this man, the case had to be taken to the shop committee, then to arbitration, with lawyers employed on both sides. After more than 3 weeks of litigation, the man was finally discharged at a cost of more than a thousand dollars to the management in lawyer's fees.

Yet when the union sends an employee undesirable to it, flying, the company would have to enter into endless debate to keep him. So it meekly accepts the union verdict, no matter how valuable the man may be, for the sake of peace, and because the management is already devoting almost all its time to union meetings and arguments instead of to production.

By such methods the union has taken over from management the power of dismissal, and the workers know it.

As I shall show later, the union has not built up its stranglehold on the company overnight nor solely on the contract, but through the continuous and brilliant leadership of a powerful personality, its president, Tom De Lorenzo, who has taken shrewd advantage of the company's incompetence and of changing management over a period of years.

Managements have come and gone, but the union and Tom De Lorenzo have been on the job uninterruptedly, establishing precedents and customs to augment their legal hold upon the company and its employees. But if past managements have been inefficient, De Lorenzo now finds himself confronted with a bird of different feathers, for in March when the Navy appointed Riebel as president, it also put in Henry J. Kaiser, the west-coast wizard, as chairman of the board. So far Mr. Kaiser left everything in Mr. Riebel's hands, but as of yesterday he made his first move by appointing Harry Morton to take over labor relations.

UNION MADE THE BOSS

But before we enter the field of personalities, let us take a look at some of the major provisions of the contract. The maintenance-of-membership clause is absolute, but the executives are not opposed to the closed shop; in itself this situation is not different from that of other closed-shop plants, but this clause and a rigid insistence upon seniority have enabled the union to undermine every last vestige of managerial control.

Paul Krebs, secretary of the union and De Lorenzo's man Friday, told me that they insist upon observance of seniority at any price, even that of production, because they must protect the future of the union's membership when the war is over and the layoffs begin. Seniority like the closed shop has its merit, but this is a question of the abuse of a legitimate union principle.

At Brewster, seniority is used, together with strikes, slow-ups, and constant obstruction of transfers, to prove to the company who is boss.

The Coast Guard strike at Johnsville is a case in point as this whole rumpus hinged on the right of the guards to bid for their posts according to seniority at the expiration of every 6 months. This practice had not hitherto existed but it had taken place once, and on that basis, the union claimed that it was a good old-fashioned custom.

The union leadership felt its accumulated power. It announced that as of August 23, the guards insisted upon bidding for posts. In the union leaders' favor is their assertion that the Navy had promised that membership in the Coast Guard would not nullify

the men's union status. The Navy claims it said no such thing.

In any case, the Navy has to have flexibility in changing the guards as the protection of valuable materials and the handling of people, at the gate, for example, are very different jobs. When the fatal August 23 arrived, four men refused to accept their Navy assignment, and were promptly thrown in the brig. Last week the War Labor Board ruled that in the new agreement, "nothing shall be construed in any way to interfere with the organization, training, and control by the Navy Department of the company guard force."

UNION LOSES A DECISION

The union took its first defeat philosophically, but the very fact that it was willing to take on the Navy, and called a strike to prove it, shows how heady the behavior of Local 365, U. A. W., can be. The cost of the strike was 164,000 man-hours of work or the equivalent of about 15 planes.

The incident also demonstrated to the public what the Brewster company has to contend with day in, day out, and it will make more credible to what fantastic lengths the union goes in its interference with daily management to uphold its seniority rule.

Until the War Manpower Commission recently insisted upon a better balance of the day and night shifts, the night shift was hobbling along on a skeleton crew because most of the skilled workers who have the seniority refused to accept night duty and couldn't be forced to accept it against their will.

Three weeks ago a new fighter line was instituted at Johnsville which was still out of balance between skilled and unskilled workers when I was there last week because the shifting of workers from one department to the other, or for that matter within the department, is always attended by endless talk back and forth between the shop committee, the workers, and the management during which incalculable numbers of man-hours are lost.

BETWEEN DEVIL AND SEA

Do such conditions mean that the 21,000 Brewster workers are less patriotic than those at other factories? Not in the least. It means that they are confused as to where their torn loyalties should lie, because the union has real power over their destinies, their chance to work and to progress, and the company has none.

Even the company foremen say to themselves: "The management changes, but if I'm not at loggerheads with the union, I'll still be a foreman when the latest management goes." The union's power over the worker is such that it can and does stage a strike, a walk-out, or a slow-up on the most trivial pretext.

Since May 31, 1942, there have been 13 different stoppages or slow-ups and strikes which the company calculates as costing 719,337 man-hours, or the time it takes to make 65 military planes. In money wasted they represent between one and two million dollars. This does not include the amount of time which is wasted daily by loafing on the job.

MANAGEMENT INCOMPETENT

But before I show how this labor union leadership has consolidated its power, it should be stated that this loafing is not all due to the workers' confused state of mind. Much of it is due to past and present incompetence on the part of management.

When I was in the Johnsville plant some 25 women workers surrounded me to talk because the welding department had nothing to do. They claimed that they had had very little to do for the past 2 months.

"When work comes in, we fight for it" said one of them, "because we are so anxious

to work." "I've been here 3 weeks" wailed another, "and I'm not getting any experience."

In several of the other departments it was the same story, now a lack of tools, now a lack of materials. "Production planning in Brewster has always been bad," said one foreman, "and is getting rapidly worse."

Riebel, the president, himself said that this was one of the company's weaknesses, but much of it he blamed on the national over-all planning for the aircraft industry. But I have been in enough airplane factories to know that though shortage of materials hampers all of them to some extent, I have never seen such acute, widespread, and apparently continuous shortages as bedevil the Brewster plants.

ABSENTEEISM ACCEPTED

But this is not the only weakness of management to be seen even by so inexperienced an observer as I. Discipline of the workers is nonexistent, which, no doubt, is largely due to the fact that respect for the union exceeds that for management. But management seems to have signed off to an extent which must be humiliating. The problem of absenteeism which is acute in all three factories is looked upon as inevitable. Among women it is 12 percent, the average for all employees 8 percent.

My questions as to what management was doing to combat absenteeism were considered surprising, as if it were just an act of God and nobody's fault.

Turn-over is low in all three plants. Though the workers do not separate themselves from the pay roll as readily as in most airplane factories, they seem to stay away or come in late whenever they please. Only in extreme cases are workers dismissed for absenteeism. The company is now initiating a program for combating it.

HOW UNION PROFITS

What probably contributes to absenteeism is that so many of the workers have little or nothing to do, and it certainly is a great factor in the lack of morale among the employees.

It was constant mismanagement of this sort in the past 4 years which gave the union its chance to consolidate its powers.

The first fight was conducted on an improvement of haphazard wage rates. This defined the union as the workers' friend and protector. As soon as the other plants were opened, the union set about improving its organization until it is a perfect tool for shop control.

Under the president is a vice president in each of the three plants, as well as a chairman of the joint shop committee, a chairman of each separate shop committee, and under them section stewards, whose number is in proportion to the size of the department, each handling about 75 men.

One former steward informed me that these stewards are given systematic instructions in a technique for harassing the management.

Formerly the management also had leadmen, union members, in charge of small groups which left the management completely devoid of control at the lowest level. The Treasury stabilization unit permitted the company to raise the leadmen's salaries and promote them to be section subforemen, non-union positions. After a 3-month battle this improvement in management's position took place, though the union is still fighting for the replacement of these leadmen for the purpose of controlling supervision.

In addition, there is a union executive board of 17 men who are on the company pay roll, sometimes to the tune of \$8,000, although they devote their whole time to the affairs of the union. This means about \$100,000 of taxpayers' money in the union's pocket, since the company is largely on a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract. This is a mat-

ter of public record in the War Labor Board proceedings.

THE TRIAL BOARD

One of the most important factors in union control is its trial board. The union shop, together with the vague seniority clause which the union can always reinterpret to suit immediate objectives, gives the union leaders complete control of shop operations. The trial board adds to these powers an almost tyrannical control of the workers themselves.

Moreover, the union has not hesitated to use this instrument as a star chamber for the punishment of the slightest infringement of its orders. To be sure, the court is elected, but the ticket can be fixed through union caucus methods.

The source of the Board's influence arises from the fact that it cannot only fine and suspend union members but expel them and make it impossible for the victim to secure another job in any union shop. The worker has the right of appeal to the international U. A. W.-C. I. O., and thence to the civil courts, but a worker without a job can scarcely afford such costly proceedings.

As a result, the influence of the Board is felt by all of the workers as an intimidating force.

Some cases of which I secured photostatic records will illustrate the lengths to which the Board goes in its disciplinary sentences. On June 24, 25, 26, a stoppage occurred at Johnsville because the company dismissed for loafing in a fuselage three women who were still in the probationary period, which it had a perfect right to do.

Thirteen people were variously punished for not quitting at once when the stoppage was called. Among them was George Spano, a flight inspector, who had a plane in the air. He refused to desert his responsibilities until the plane returned. Called before the Board, he said in strong language that he couldn't leave his pilot in the air. Thereupon he was cited for "using language unbecoming to brother workers" and suspended for 30 days without pay, although he is an irreplaceable man.

Among a list of some 30 cases are such union charges as "giving orders in his department without authority," "insubordination to department stewards," "reporting union brother in violation of company rules to a management supervisor" (this for reporting with witnesses a fellow member asleep during working hours). The most frequent charge is "remaining at work during a stoppage." These court decisions have to be upheld by the union membership, but woe betide any worker who would dare raise his hand in open opposition to a decision of the trial body.

The union power to intimidate workers was most clearly illustrated in the famous guard strike at Johnsville.

The employees, not singly but in large groups, assured me that they did not want to go out on that occasion; that they not only disapproved of the strike but were still ashamed of it.

"Then," said I, "why did you all vote for it the day after it was called?" They explained that there is no secret ballot on strikes or any other union matters except the election of union officials. They did not dare oppose the union decision. They were indignant at the fact that they have no secret ballot.

Although these urban workers are more union-minded than those in most large war industries, they are thoroughly unhappy about their lack of freedom. "We have good wages now," said one young man, "but the Brewster employees have found out that wages alone cannot make a man happy. We are just as patriotic as any other Americans. We don't like these slow-ups and strikes. Some of us are ashamed of the fact that we work in a factory with such a reputation,

but when the shop steward points toward the door with his thumb we have to go or get in 'dutch.' The worst of it is that hard work and ability count for nothing in this set-up. If you want to stay in this place and get along or be upgraded, you have to stand in with the shop stewards."

"The company foremen can't do a thing for you. You have to be in with the clique that runs the show."

IN CONCLUSION

This whole history illustrates what I saw all through the country during my 3 months' tour of our war centers. The leaders of labor, especially of the U. A. W.-C. I. O., are among the ablest men in the country and not infrequently the superiors of their managements. These labor leaders have had to battle their way to the top just as management did two or three generations ago.

But today too many of our highest business and industrial executives are the easygoing descendants of their rugged forebears. They have to compete with a labor leadership that has achieved its position by sheer personal merit.

Fortunately the U. A. W.-C. I. O. has among its international leaders men very different from Tom De Lorenzo, men like Walter Reuther who have a statesmanlike point of view. Walter Reuther said to me when I last saw him in Detroit:

"The time has come when labor leaders must modify their purely aggressive techniques and learn to cooperate with management if private industry is to survive in America."

What America seems to need in the field of management is more Henry Kaisers. The active intervention in the Brewster situation of this production genius began last week with the appointment of his west coast trouble shooter, Harry Morton, to take charge of labor relations. If he can teach Tom De Lorenzo the meaning of the word "cooperation," Mr. Kaiser will not only get out the planes, but his contribution to Tom's education might save the Nation a lot of trouble in the post-war world.

TOM DE LORENZO IS JUST STARTING—BREWSTER UNION DICTATOR IS FORMIDABLE AND ASTONISHING

After gathering the amazing picture of a beautifully organized tyranny (discussed in the adjoining columns), I was naturally curious to see the man whom everybody gave the somewhat dubious credit of being the unquestioned dictator, not only of the union at the Brewster plant, but of the whole situation, Tom De Lorenzo, president of Local 365.

I expected a forceful personality, but what I could see in this firmly built 35-year-old American of Italian descent was a good deal more than I expected.

If I am any judge of people, the country is going to hear a lot more from Tom De Lorenzo.

He was born and grew up in New York, in a section of the city where every boy has to fight his way from the moment he is out of diapers. De Lorenzo is still fighting his way upward. It is my impression that nobody can stop him.

As there was no use mincing my language with this two-fisted, forthright labor leader, I confronted him at once with his statement to the company president, Mr. Riebel, at a meeting with the negotiating committee:

"Our policy is not to win the war at any cost. The policy of our local union is to win the war without sacrificing too many of the rights which we have at the present time."

"That sounds to me as if you put your union above your country," I asserted.

"I'm willing to take a chance and talk frankly to you," came the surprising response, "because I like your husband's letter on Congressman Cox. Any newspaper that cares

that much about civil liberties may give even a labor leader a fair hearing. My statement to Riebel was made negatively because I wanted to make clear what the union is trying to do within the shop, and that the company can't get anywhere by merely trying to out-negotiate the union."

QUESTIONS COMPANY'S SINCERITY

"Don't you believe the company is carrying on those negotiations for the sole purpose of getting production?"

"No, I don't."

There was no use trying to break down his conviction that the company is trying to undermine union rights, so I gave that up and changed the subject.

"What is your reaction to the War Labor Board's decision that the Navy must control the guards?"

"I expected it. The War Labor Board had to give the military forces precedence over civil rights in time of war and, therefore, I bow to their decision. In fact, if I had known that our men were subject to court martial and jail for disobedience I would have told the guards to obey. I would never have let those men risk going to jail. The strike was not sound because we had no chance of winning."

"But what about the other strikes and slow-downs?" I countered. "In speaking of strikes at his news conference on the War Labor Board decision, W. H. Davis said that strikes are not only illegal now, under the 'no-strike clause,' they are in effect not strikes against a company but against the Nation and the war effort. On that basis you are sabotaging production and endangering the national safety."

As patiently as if I had asked him the time of day, he answered:

"I have one goal or aim; I want the war over as soon as possible, but I want conditions to be no worse in the country than when we started. The most important thing in this war is to preserve the system of government that we have, among other things, and the procedure for adjudicating union troubles. There is no sense in winning the war if we are going to lose all those privileges."

HAS TO WEIGH HIS CHANCES

"All right, but if everybody thought and acted the way you do, we wouldn't have enough production to win the war and then where would your union privileges be?"

"I have to weigh how far I can go," was the astounding but honest reply.

"All my life I have found force to be the only effective weapon. Sometimes you just have to use it, even if it means stopping the planes. It has always been effective until the guard situation arose. And I'm sure if we had laid out that strike more effectively, we would have won that point, too."

"If I had brothers at the front who needed the 10 or 12 planes that were sacrificed, I'd let them die, if necessary, to preserve our way of life or rights or whatever you want to call it. Democracy is too broad and meaningless a term. What's more, if I were in their place, I'd expect them to do the same thing. I'd expect them to let me die."

"The real trouble with the Brewster Co. is that we have never had an efficient management. The people the Navy has put in here know nothing about manufacturing airplanes, and they don't know anything about getting on with people. Sometimes I am convinced that it would be best for the Navy to shut down the Brewster plants and let the people go work somewhere else where there is efficient management."

HOPES FOR IMPROVEMENT NOW

"But if management is inefficient, our union has a first-rate organization. Under our contract we can stop any innovations in which we do not believe. But what I want to prove above all things, and especially to the

Navy Department, is that we can be of use to the war effort if we are utilized properly by an efficient management such as H. J. Kaiser is famous for and can give us."

"I know that with Harry Morton (Kaiser's recent appointment), in charge of labor relations, things will improve. And with Kaiser sending in some people who know something about production, Kaiser style, I am convinced that all the men in the shop, in spite of being union members, will be interested in winning this war as quickly as possible, and will prove it to the world by producing the ships we need."

That was a conciliatory ending and I am sure the man meant it. But at this very moment he is at the U. A. W.-C. I. O. convention fighting with the support of a majority of the delegates from local 365 for the abrogation of the no-strike clause.

Such an attitude during war, as well as the statement he made to me, will be condemned by many people. But it should not be forgotten that a tough, competitive environment produced Tom De Lorenzo, made him the formidable mind and character that he is, and led him to believe through hard experience that nothing but force can be relied upon by those who want to survive.

In the 3 years of his union leadership, he has encountered only managers who confirmed his faith in force by going down before him like a lot of ninepins, thus making it easy for him to build up what he calls unions rights, but which are, in fact, tyrannical powers that represent a menace not only to the Brewster Co. but to the sound development of the labor movement.

AGNES E. MEYER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a few remarks I had intended to make for the past 2 weeks but have been unable to, and to attach thereto an editorial from the Detroit Free Press, dated September 23 of this year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much disturbed by, and somewhat suspicious of, the press reports regarding the possible shift of Gen. George C. Marshall, the Chief of Staff. Particularly disturbing and unbelievable were reports that a prospective change in status for this great warrior-leader entailed, under whatever title or pretense, a demotion rather than advancement. Of course, I hold General Marshall in highest esteem. I rate him as one of the greatest soldiers and military leaders that this Nation ever produced. He is plain, persevering, and productive, a master strategist whose abilities have been recognized by his superiors even in the First World War. His name and fame is not known alone in this country or the Western Hemisphere but throughout the entire world. Though of positive character, he is soft-spoken, kindly, and thoroughly human. I believe his character embraces all of the fine attributes of a Christian gentleman, of an American, of a man.

I believe his very fine qualities, his experience, and his great accomplishments

have been recognized by the highest authorities in the land. First among these was the Chief Executive, his Commander in Chief, when he considered and named George C. Marshall as Chief of Staff from a field of brilliant generals among whom more than one rated by seniority the post of Chief of Staff. The President, in his wisdom, elevated to the leadership of our armies this modest though capable officer because he believed beyond any doubt that George C. Marshall was deserving, because he was preeminently qualified. I believe, in fact I am confident, there was no extraneous, no unwholesome motive in the President's choice at the time of his selection, and the brilliant record of the present Chief of Staff since his elevation justified the President's action and proved his excellent judgment of men. Why, then, would anyone today have cause to infer, assume, or presume that the President of the United States would, after continuing by reappointment General Marshall as Chief of Staff, undertake by some means or method to seek his demotion at this the most critical time in our Nation's history?

I feel that I would like to go along with General Marshall in the fulfillment of any role which he himself might choose. Not being a military expert, I do not know for a certainty whether it would be an added honor to General Marshall's brilliant military career were he chosen to lead the final and all-out invasion of the Nazi-held European stronghold, but it appears that it would be a great and an historical achievement if, with his valiant sword, he pointed the way for the millions of young Americans who would thus follow him toward the liberation of the oppressed and the restoration of human freedom throughout the world. It is particularly true, if reports as yet unfounded are worthy of credence, that both Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt decided upon making of Marshall the leader in the global war and the generalissimo of all of the American-British forces throughout the world.

It is unfortunate that Marshall's name should be bandied about so recklessly by irresponsible scribes and newspaper pharisees who, as Roosevelt haters, underhandedly are seeking to discredit the President as the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy and that such reprehensible methods would be employed at this particular time, the time when the Nation needs unity more than it needs anything else to accomplish the one great purpose which was expressed with our declaration of war against the Axis. It must be a great disappointment and unjustified embarrassment to this great and retiring soldier. As usual, he is silent while a synthetic storm is raging, occupied with the manifold and complex problems of an indescribably difficult task.

As a soldier he will prove his greatness by serving his country wherever he may be called. The Commander in Chief will, I am sure, promote General Marshall as he deserves to be. No one in this country needs plead the cause of the Army's foremost leader because his value was

recognized by the President far in advance of the rest of the people, and, since Marshall has proved his capacity even to the inclusion of those who may have had some doubt, certainly the President would be the last to do him an injustice by any demotion at this time. I am sure that whatever course the Commander in Chief shall choose will have for its lofty purpose the further recognition and the employment of Marshall's outstanding leadership and ability.

Plans, tactics, and stratagems of this war are fundamentally and substantially those of the modest though able Chief of Staff, the details of which have been worked out by his assistants. Who, then, in the entire Army would be in a better position to put them into effect? Whatever the future may hold for Marshall, whatever course he may be directed to follow, I can only visualize his great accomplishments and glory in the service of his country.

[From the Detroit Free Press of September 23, 1943]

WE'RE FIGHTING A WAR—NO POLITICS!

Keep politics out of this war!

The soldiers of America now scattered over the face of the globe are not fighting and offering up their lives for the Democratic Party or the Republican Party or any other political group.

They are fighting for the preservation of this Nation and the right of human beings everywhere to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They are dying in battle to rid the earth of a scourge that threatens all that we hold sacred.

To use their valiance for partisan political purposes is to render mean and contemptible the supreme sacrifice many of them are making.

Wars are not won by newspaper headlines, by mouthing politicians on the rostrum, or by glib columnists and commentators.

Yet there are men in the Halls of our National Congress who are willing and eager to use this Armageddon of the human race for their own petty advantages.

This is the first war in the history of the United States for which we have been fully prepared.

Both President Roosevelt, as Commander in Chief, and Prime Minister Churchill have made their reports to their peoples through their legislative bodies, and, with pardonable pride, they have spoken of the achievements of the United Nations.

President Roosevelt paused in the writing of his message to pay special tribute to the tremendous tasks performed so magnificently by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

Yet the ink is hardly dry upon the printed page of his report before cock-eyed rumors are sprung that Marshall is either to be deposed or kicked upstairs. These ugly rumors go on to explain that the reason for all this is that Marshall is not liked by the British because he does not see eye to eye with Churchill.

So, with the ill-logic of such people, it is further contended that he is to be placed in charge of the European war front—upon which will depend the very life of Great Britain.

If the English do not like Marshall, it stands to reason they would not accept him as the commander of their offense and defense. But logic has nothing to do with mean and petty politics.

In answer to this there comes another report that instead of being demoted the great American chief is to be made complete

commander of all Anglo-American forces throughout the world.

The Free Press makes no claims to omniscience. What was agreed upon at the Quebec conference we do not pretend to know, nor do we think it our business to know. Such matters must be sacredly secret. It is viciously unfair to these leaders and of great benefit to the enemy even to conjecture—and thereby start such wild rumors that can only be of disservice to the cause.

The Free Press has said before, and now repeats, that the Republican leaders who have tossed the honored name of Gen. Douglas MacArthur into the political arena, as a hope of winning an election, have done both him and the national cause an injury.

MacArthur is a soldier, not a politician. Nobody to this day knows what his political party affiliations are, if any.

He is naturally not unaware of this movement to make him the party leader of the Republicans. He has not repudiated it.

Therefore, anything that he now says is not taken as the word of a soldier dedicating his life to a mighty military cause. He is suspect immediately of political ambitions.

When he issues a statement from his southwest Pacific headquarters, as he did Tuesday, that he stands ready to play "a secondary role" and inferentially criticizes the program worked out by his commanding officers, we naturally think of the late great Gen. Billy Mitchell.

One of the chief criticisms of Mitchell was that he talked too much for publicity purposes and publicly criticized his superiors, a violation of the rigid military code of ethics and discipline. And Gen. Douglas MacArthur was on that trial board which condemned him to dismissal.

Not in the history of military literature is there a more poignant testimonial of a pledge than that given by General MacArthur upon his departure from the Philippines, that he would return. Nobody in his right senses has any idea that the Pacific war will be over by next summer. Therefore, how could MacArthur become a candidate for the Presidency without giving up the fight to which he has pledged his life?

A great soldier and a great patriot has been put in a false light by the political ambitions of a few Republican leaders.

And MacArthur's statement of Tuesday lends encouragement to their ambitions.

So far we have fought this war successfully because big men in both parties have submerged their differences and have fought shoulder to shoulder.

Now that victory is in sight—though far from won—it is no time to endanger that victory by breaking up a winning combination through discord wrought by selfish ambitions and cheap politics.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a column written by Blair Moody, of the Detroit News, The Low-Down on Washington, with regard to the tax problem now before Congress—a very interesting and commendable article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, as usual, this is one of our semiweekly vesper hours. In my humble opinion it serves a very useful purpose. Certainly it may be

a trespass upon the time of some, but it enables me to clarify my own thinking; in addition I hope it makes available some summarized historical information on problems that will confront us from time to time.

There is an impending issue; it is being formulated at this moment in the Committee on Banking and Currency. It might be styled an echo of the issue of that period just before we recessed when we were engaged in the battle of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the battle of subsidies. At the moment the Committee on Banking and Currency is holding a hearing. No bill has been introduced. It is being held upon a type-written bill, so neither you nor I unless you have had the good fortune to see this proposal may know what is in it. I made careful search at the document room to see whether a Member of another body whose name under the rules I cannot mention here had introduced the bill and I found that he had not. I found also that no Member of this body had introduced a bill; but the battle is in the making, and in a little while we shall be concerned once more with the whole question of subsidies as a part of our food program.

I sometimes wonder whether when we are dealing with these problems it would not be better after all to avoid rather than enact legislation of doubtful value. I recall that the first major depression in the history of the civilized world took place in Rome several thousand years ago. It came about when a broker in Rome had gotten a corner on all the purple dye and all the ostrich feathers in the known world. He went to the principal bank in Rome and there he negotiated a very substantial loan. The dye and ostrich feathers were imported from Phoenicia, or some other distant place. Unfortunately the vessel went down. The cargo was lost and there was no insurance as a hedge against that bank loan, and the first great major banking enterprise in the history of the civilized world failed, and there ensued out of that failure a depression. They did exactly nothing about it. They rode out that depression, and the world has ridden out every major depression from then on until the depression of 1929. The world went forward, some people were washed out, some businesses had to go through the wringer, which seems to be one of those inevitable incidents of an economic dislocation, but they finally came out and the world went on just the same. We have a new technique today. We must see what we can put on the books and how fast we can put it there. When I go back and read history, I try to evaluate all these enactments to see what good they did for our current problem and I often believe that too many of them did exactly no good considering the amount of the people's money that was invested therein.

We talk about this Commodity Credit bill, about the subject of food, and about all the things that we have done in the last 20 years or a little more. Perhaps a bit of summarized history will be of assistance. Our first agricultural de-

pression began in 1920; that is when we first began to hear about an agricultural depression and about proposals to meet it. In 1920, as you recall, we first lost our foreign markets, or at least they declined very substantially. Then there was a price collapse and then the farm depression began. That was 23 years ago. Now let us look at the 8-year period from 1920 on to see what was done by way of legislative efforts in order to meet that economic problem. In 1921 this Congress passed the so-called Packers and Stockyards Act. In 1921 there was organized a group that frankly I know nothing about, but the history books record that in 1941 there was organized in Congress the farm bloc.

In 1922 we had a national agricultural conference in Washington for the purpose of dealing with farm prices and farm supplies.

In 1922 Congress enacted the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill and in the debates of that period an especial point was made and special emphasis was laid upon the fact that Congress had to set up some kind of restraint in order to prevent the dumping of foreign agricultural commodities on to our own markets.

In 1923 the Congress passed the Agricultural Credit Act.

In 1926 we first heard of hybrid corn, which gives us an increased yield and produces more vigorous varieties. In 1926 there was first proposed the so-called debenture export plan, commonly known in our political and congressional history as the McNary-Haugen bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. There is a vast difference between the debenture plan and the McNary-Haugen bill. They were not even related.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman is right. It was the export debenture plan that we first heard of in 1926. Then we heard also in 1926 of the McNary-Haugen plan, which was enacted in 1927 and vetoed.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield for another suggestion?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman talks about a farm bloc being organized back in those days. If he will search the record he will find that I made a speech on the floor of the House, as did other Members, inquiring who the farm bloc was and the only person we could find who was a member of it at that time was the man who advertised himself as the head of it, Mr. Dickinson of Iowa.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Mississippi will recall that on so many occasions I have spoken about this mythical farm bloc. I know nothing about it either. But the current history back in 1921 indicates, and this you will find in literature of the Department of Agriculture, that a farm bloc was organized at that time.

Mr. RANKIN. That was the mythical farm bloc to which the gentleman refers. It was myth indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman and I thoroughly agree on that point.

In 1928 the McNary-Haugen bill was vetoed the second time.

Then in 1929 there came the Federal Farm Board to deal with what? Believe it or not, to deal with surpluses. That is almost an archaic word, but that board was set up under Alexander Legge to deal with the question of surpluses, getting wheat out of the country or diverting it to relief channels as well as meeting the incipient farm panic in 1929.

When that second major farm depression came in 1929 there were other folks who had ideas on how to deal with it. A new program of legislation was then sponsored. First came the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill of 1930, about which we have heard so much. Then came the Farm Credit Act of 1933, which was followed by the first Agricultural Adjustment Act and the creation of the first Agricultural Adjustment Administration in 1933. There came the Soil Conservation Act of 1935, and in that same year the President, by Executive order, created the Farm Security Administration.

There was also the Farm Credit Act of 1933 and the Farm Credit Act of 1935 which set up the so-called production-credit corporations and production-credit associations.

About this same time there was established the Rural Agricultural Credit Corporation, with which we dealt only recently in the agricultural appropriation bill. We made provision for emergency seed and feed loans. We created an agricultural-marketing service. We passed the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934, which was designed to increase trade with foreign countries and to expedite the export of farm products.

In the same year we passed the Silver Purchase Act, one of the greatest abominations that was ever inscribed upon the statute books by an intelligent Congress. The idea was, of course, to develop a greater flow of commodities to those countries that were on a silver basis. We thought it was going to work out, but the net result was we pushed China on to a managed-currency basis; it did not do Mexico or Bolivia any good, yet that act is still on the statute books of the Nation.

Then we set up a Cotton Stabilization Corporation in 1930.

There was the Marketing Agreement Act of 1937. There was the Division of Subsistence Homesteads created by Executive order in 1933. There was the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation also created by Executive order in 1933, which later became the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation. Then there was created by Executive order the Resettlement Administration in 1935.

There was considerable jockeying with the so-called parity in all that period. Why was all this? It was only because somebody said that we had too much of everything, there was a great surplus in the world, a great surplus in this country, so there must be enactment by Congress and huge appropriations for the purpose of dealing with a surplus of

everything in the food line and for that matter in the fiber line.

We developed a real fear of our capacity. We went around shouting about the beneficences of the good earth that had produced so much as to cause a real national problem and, for that matter, a world problem. So we as intelligent legislators must address ourselves to the problem of dealing with too much, an amazing thing.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. I just wonder if the gentleman has any data since the surplus has vanished of the liquidation of any of the agencies that were created while the surplus was on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman we have always had a surplus of Federal agencies, it seems, and we have not been particularly diligent in this body in abolishing a good many of them. Now and then by luck or circumstance we abolish one or two. We abolished the Civilian Conservation Corps. We worked for a few years and finally met with success in liquidating the National Youth Administration. Incidentally, there is a move on in the country right now to restore it, and a very distinguished Senator has introduced the bill to revive it. So it seems that when you do give them the death stab they do not stay dead. It means that we must be constantly vigilant if we are going to win in this great battle of the Congress versus the rising bureaucracy. So I say to the gentleman from Ohio, we will get to that in just a moment.

We were dealing with a surplus in 1932 and 1933 and from then on.

How did we propose to deal with it? Well, there was a fivefold attack. The first one was to produce less. And how do you produce less? You either shrink your tillable domain or you impose acreage restrictions so that you do not produce as much as you did before. That was attack No. 1.

Attack No. 2 was to export more, get the surplus out of the country if we could.

Attack No. 3 was to consume more, get it into channels of consumption if it were possible.

Attack No. 4 was new uses. I remember when I appeared on the Memorial Highway in 1933 with the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE and the Honorable Rexford Guy Tugwell and a great many other people for the purpose of developing an interest in the conversion of cereal grain into an alcohol of an anhydrous type which could be admixed with motor fuel for the purpose of giving us a premium motor fuel at a cheaper price, and at the same time getting rid of some of this monumental, overhanging, and disastrous surplus that they told us existed only 10 years ago. That was attack No. 4, namely, new uses.

Finally, there was the attack of holding it off the market, in storage, and then letting it feed under a control plan into the market so as not to shake the price structure too much.

What did we do in carrying out that fivefold attack? First, through the Agricultural Adjustment Act there were these restrictions on acreage accompanied by cash benefits.

Second, in exporting more we had trade agreements, we had the Silver Purchase Act of 1934, we set up the Export-Import Bank, and we set up the Federal Surplus Commodity Corporation.

Under attack No. 3, to consume more, we developed a program of relief purchases, a program of school lunches, and a program of food stamps. The amazing thing is that while we started out with food stamps for the folks in the low-income bracket we finally wound up by putting the whole Nation on food stamps, as you so well know today under O. P. A.

Under the proposal for new uses we created the four regional research laboratories in different sections of the country. Let it be said to the everlasting credit of those scientific men, who are the best men working for the Government today, that they are doing a very phenomenal job.

Finally, there was this technique of holding things off the market and feeding them in a little at a time, making it possible for the farmer to hold it under seal. That is where our old friend the Commodity Credit Corporation comes into the picture.

I started out with the premise that we do so much, and sometimes it is of doubtful value. The hand of Nature suddenly intervened for a couple of years. That great providential hand made the sun to shine brighter and longer, and the Architect of the Universe, for reasons best known to Himself, withheld the moisture. At one fell swoop Nature itself did more than all of the things we wrote upon the statute books for a 10-year period in reducing what they said was a great surplus of everything and too much of everything.

I am interested today in this one attack upon that problem of surplus because it is with us, it was with us in June, and it will be with us again in a little while, and every Member of this body who is here will be called upon once more to record himself on this question of extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with enough additional money out of the taxpayer's pocket or the loan power in order to subsidize the purchase and sale of farm products.

So that problem is with us, born in the days of surplus, when as a part of this attack the Commodity Credit Corporation was created to make loans to hold commodities off the market for the purpose of letting prices rise.

As I go back to that period there is one thing I ought to mention in that whole program, and that is the Gold Reserve Act of 1934. I never will forget an old gentleman from our side of the House who had a very brilliant mind, Representative Luce, of Massachusetts, who was the ranking Republican on the Committee on Banking and Currency, one of the most brilliant students in legislative history. I remember the day he stood here and prophesied that it would be a sorry day for this country, it would be

a distressing day for the world, when finally we took this country off the gold standard. I am not so sure but that old Bob Luce was right. But we took the country off the gold standard and it is still off; and maybe it will never get back on the gold standard. It may be that if we had retained a real monetary base such as we knew in other years and that helped us to weather other depressions we would have been infinitely better off. But we are off the gold standard today. That was part of the business of this attack of producing less, of exporting more, or consuming more, of filtering into the market a little bit at a time for the purpose of bringing the prices up. These many approaches whereby we tinkered with our fiscal structure to push prices up, or hold them or pull them down, brings to mind the story about the fellow who had that little mule that was balky and obstreperous and with which he could do nothing. This mule undertook to lie down on the pavement in the very center of town. He tried beating that mule over the nose. It did no good. He even resorted to building a fire under that little beast. It did no good. Finally the veterinarian came along and said, "Joe, what's the matter?" He said, "Can't do a thing with this mule." So the veterinarian reached in his case and got out one of these syringes and squirted something into that mule's hindquarters, and the little beast got up and started right off down the street. Joe watched the departing mule and said, "Doctor, how much was that?" "Oh, that will be about 10 cents." "Well," he said, "here is 30 cents. Give me two shots so I can catch that mule."

It can scarcely be denied that we were squirting little doses into the economic system to make prices go up, putting capstones on them at the time, holding them there, making them come down again. It took a rather rugged and virile kind of free-enterprise system to absorb the recurring shocks of what Congress tried to do for it and what Congress did to it. And yet it endured all this and still survives.

Is it any wonder that you got the civilian economy of this country out of gear? All that was done for what reason? Because there was too much, so they said. Well, was there? Not now. All in 10 years. I can stand here in 1943 and say, "Too much? Not now. But too little now." So now we are to be confronted with proposals now to deal with too little.

History is a very interesting thing, and historical cycles are interesting, indeed, as we go from too much to too little all in one single decade.

Mr. BUFFETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is quoting history quite liberally. Can he cite any instance in history where any price-fixing scheme has worked and has not resulted finally in some sort of disaster?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether I can answer that in the affirmative or not without a little further

research. Perhaps the gentleman has done some special work in that field.

Mr. BUFFETT. I will answer the gentleman in this way, that I have studied a great many price-fixing schemes from Diocletian on down to the French Revolution, and a good many in this country, and none has ever succeeded in its intention, that I could find.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman has made an excellent historical statement upon the agricultural machinery with which we have attempted to solve some of the ills that beset the farmer. In mentioning the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with the question just asked, the gentleman will agree with me, will he not, that the fixing of 85 percent of mandatory loans by the Commodity Credit Corporation did result in bringing farm prices more nearly to their just and equitable level?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. In a way, is that not a form of price fixing? Price support is a form of price fixing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from Nebraska asked about price fixing. That was the question of the gentleman from Nebraska—whether it was not true that over a period of time it hardened into permanency. I understood that to be his question.

Mr. MONRONEY. My understanding of his question was whether or not price fixing ever worked. I do recall that the instrumentality of using a strong support price, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, did result in farm prices going up from 80 percent of parity to 85 percent of parity overnight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We should understand ourselves about terms. Setting a floor under a price is not putting a ceiling on a price. We supported those prices.

Mr. MONRONEY. I beg to disagree with the gentleman. If you are fixing a price, you are fixing it whether you are supporting a price or whether you are limiting a price. It is an instrumentality that works in either direction. Permitting merchandise to find its own price in a free market is not price fixing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not price fixing as this Congress has understood it. To put a floor under a price and let that price operate in a free economy above that floor is one thing, but a rigid price fixing is another. Setting a floor is quite another.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I was going to say that I am sure a majority of the Members of Congress did not consider these commodity loans as price fixing, because that would have put us in the unhappy position of freezing the farmer's price at 85 percent of parity, which would mean it was the intent of Congress that the farmers for all time to come should be 15 percent short of cost of production, and our intention was not any such thing. So it was not price fixing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not believe our intention was to fix prices at 15 percent below parity.

Mr. MUNDT. It was an attempt to put a floor under prices, but not the fixation of a price.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I have listened carefully to the gentleman enumerating the things that have been done to the farmers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did you say "for the farmers" or "to the farmers"?

Mr. RANKIN. I said "to the farmers." But I notice he seems to have studiously avoided the greatest thing that has ever been done for the American farmer, and that is rural electrification. I will say to the gentleman that the Mackinac conference, from the standpoint of the electric-light and power consumers of America, seems to have been a complete black-out. They overlooked the fact that the American people are more interested in that one question than almost any other economic issue at this time, and yet they did not even mention it. Not only did they not mention rural electrification, but they did not mention the power question at all. I am wondering if the gentleman is going to skip over rural electrification, the greatest development that has ever taken place for the benefit of the American farmer?

Mr. DIRKSEN. You see I have to bring my friend from Mississippi up to date. As a matter of fact, there were six subcommittees established by the action taken at Mackinac Island to deal with various phases of our fiscal and economic problems on the domestic front. That of course will include this question of rural electrification. So I am quite sure he is going to be very agreeably informed by the recommendations that will be made in due time by an appropriate committee handling rural electrification.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman give us the personnel of that committee and give us some indications as to what they are going to recommend? Are they going to remain in this blackout until after election?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. Those committees are taking thought of these various matters that have been assigned to them. One of the committees that I know of, because I happen to be a member, will probably have its first meeting some time in October over in Ohio for the purpose of dealing with one segment of that whole domestic problem.

I cannot name all of the men, but I think I can get the names for the gentleman. I may say to my good friend that he might address a letter to the National Republican Committee and I am sure they will be only too glad to give these names.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to get the name of the chairman of the committee and the recommendations that they have made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The recommendations have not as yet been made, I will say to my friend, but I expect they will be made before late January.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that the R. E. A. has been one of the finest accomplishments simply for this reason: Because of the price of commodities the farmers have found it necessary to work both day and night in order to make a living and therefore the R. E. A. gave them electric light to do their night work by.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. In line with the suggestion of the other gentleman from Illinois, I suppose I should add that they are better off than they were under the Fordney-McCumber Act, when they were forced to work both day and night without light.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I hope the gentleman is going to get back to the Commodity Credit Corporation bill, but I am fearful he may not, and I would like to ask him this question: I am definitely opposed to the so-called roll-back subsidies, of having the Federal Government pay a part of my grocery bill. On the other hand I recognize that there are times or that times may arise where subsidies are necessary.

I voted against the last bill we had in here, because I did not like to say to the President of the United States, when we were going home, that he could not put any plans into effect involving a subsidy on agricultural products.

I want to ask the gentleman this question because I know of no man who is better informed on that particular bill: Under that bill, as we passed it through the Congress before we recessed, has the President the power to secure corn and ship it into areas that are out of corn and to pay the freight which, in turn, would be a subsidy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would appear, as I recall the bill and its language, he could do that; he could do it within the limitations of the money that we approved; I am sure he could, because otherwise there would have been no necessity for making the money available.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. You are of the opinion that he could do that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. As we passed the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. As we passed the bill, as I understand the gentleman to say, the President would not have been barred from using the funds for that purpose?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not think so. As I remember that bill there was no reason for putting the money in if we had had that idea in mind.

Now getting back on the track for a moment. The thesis I want to establish first of all is that we were dealing with the problem of surpluses 10 years ago and putting all sorts of legislation on our statute books, and in the space of a decade it is a case of too little rather than too much, and so our problem now is one of rationing and of keeping production going and, according to the administration, to hold prices in line, and that is the basic purpose of the legislation that is pending in one of the committees today.

Now, did we ever have too much? They say there are 2,000,000,000 people in the world today and that two-thirds of them are suffering from malnutrition, not necessarily famine, but that they do not get enough of the right kind of foods to eat, to protect and safeguard their health and give the energy that is necessary to produce a livelihood. Perhaps there never was too much back even in 1933, and that it was a case of maldistribution in the world, rather than too much.

We are now up against this problem of providing food for our own people, for our soldiers, for our sailors, and for the people in occupied areas. We are told that food will be an offset to any kind of revolutionary virus and help us to restore order and reestablish decent and stable government. There is no question but what food is one of the most important munitions of war and one of the most important instrumentalities of peace. Our problem today is just one thing and nothing more: it is the problem of production. Everybody knows it. If our problem is too little food, the task before us is to produce more food. If prices get out of line, the answer is increased production to enable the balancing effect of supply and demand and bring about a readjustment.

In considering this matter let us examine for a moment the statistics released no later than September 30 by the Office of War Information. They are genuinely enlightening.

Never in the history of the Nation were national income and deposits at such levels as they are today and yet it is

proposed to meet our problems with borrowed money.

They point out that our estimated income for 1943 will be \$142,000,000,000. The O. W. I. said that the value of all goods and services available would be ninety and six-tenths billions, so that the excess of income over goods and services available would be fifty-one and four-tenths billions. Last year they said the difference was only thirty-four billions and now it is up to nearly fifty-two billions of excess funds for available goods and services. Another thing in which you would be interested is that the money in circulation has gone to eighteen and six-tenths billions. A year ago it was five billions below that figure.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he gets away from the subsidy proposition?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not a subsidy when you pay a concern to manufacture articles on a cost-plus basis and it puts people on the pay roll and permits them to loaf around in order that the contractor may get this plus on their salaries? It not that a subsidy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; and my friend will not get any quarrel out of me on that, because I mentioned here only the other day that where there was inefficient labor in some of these defense plants something should be done about it.

Where excessive profits occur through the operation of a defense plant, the matter can be cured by the use of the renegotiation power which Congress delegated to the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission. Inefficiency, however, and the inefficient use of manpower must be attacked in another way.

Getting back for a moment to this question of national earnings, the O. W. I. says that money in checking accounts amounts to thirty-five and seven-tenths billions; money in savings deposits—this is the O. W. I. figure of September 30—thirty billions. They talk about trying to repress and repel inflation; why inflation has been here a long time; there has been lots of inflation, and if you do not believe so go down and try to buy a sirloin steak.

The trouble is we have been dealing with symptoms rather than causes. The war expenditure every day amounts to \$286,000,000—every 24 hours. There is the great inflationary source; that is more than \$12,000,000 every 60 minutes, and as that money turns over and bids for the available services and goods in the country, that is the great dynamic force for inflation. So we are trying to deal with symptoms rather than causes; and that will be precisely the case with the bill that comes from the Committee on Banking and Currency that undertakes to invoke subsidies paid on borrowed money to be repaid by the soldiers and sailors who are beating out their energies in the Pacific and in Italy and the other combat areas; that will be there for them to pay back as the citizens who will shoulder the responsibility in the generation to come. That is the picture that is facing us today.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. These banking figures do not mean anything, for when you give a man a credit on deposit there may be no money passed or deposited. The circulation statement of the United States Treasury of July 31, 1943, shows that we had in circulation in money on that date \$17,954,587,757. At the peak of prosperity following the other war, in 1920, we had only \$5,698,000,000 as against this \$17,954,000,000.

If agricultural prices were permitted to rise to their normal level at the source, cotton, wheat, corn, and dairy products would more than double at the farm. If the farmers were given the benefits that are enjoyed by others of the enormous amount of money in circulation, agricultural prices would more than double overnight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will observe to my friend from Mississippi that it depends upon which one of these two monetary theses you pursue: Whether it is a question of the velocity of goods and the velocity of the dollar on the one side or the quantity of money on the other. The quantity of money as such means nothing; it is the confidence of the people in their Government, in their administration that makes them go ahead and do business. When you get a dollar turning over 60 or 70 times that spells the difference between prosperity and adversity.

But I want to finish before my time runs out. That bill will probably be coming to this floor one of these days. You remember we solved this problem or left it in a state of suspended solution until the first of January. We have got to do something about it. It will be back here, it will be the same old struggle that we carried on in May and June, and what is the answer to this problem of too little goods and prices too high? It is produce, to produce more, and to produce still more, because the man who cannot get a pork chop will not have to care whether it costs him 20 cents a pound or 60 cents; he still cannot buy it, if it is not available. That is the essential thing today.

How shall it be solved? No. 1: Give the farmer some manpower. You cannot get more out of existing acreage or expand acreage in the country unless you have willing hands to do it. No. 2: There ought to be a greater liberality with steel so the farm machinery makers can manufacture more farm equipment. I talked with a steel man last night, and he says the steel situation is easing. I hope it eases very materially and that the War Production Board takes cognizance of it, and that there will be steel for farm machinery. No. 3: There must be fertilizer if it can be gotten. No. 4: There must be seed and, finally, there has got to be some profit incentive for the farmer to go out there and beat the soil day after day, early and late. There has got to be a livelihood for him, and the way to give him a livelihood is to peel off the restrictions, give him a fair price, and quit jockeying with this infernal parity business all the time, trying to snatch a little here and pinch off a little there until instead

of \$1.07 for corn, which he does not get, he gets \$1.07 minus a marketing charge and minus the freight rate to the nearest terminal.

If a farmer in my township sells corn, it does not make any difference to whom he sells it. The man next door might come and say he will buy it for \$1.07, and he will scoop it from the crib into his truck and say, "I will give you \$1.07 for it." If the selling farmer takes \$1.07 he violates the O. P. A. regulation and they are in fact pursuing farmers today who sold corn out in the Midwest because they did not sell at the ceiling price less that marketing charge, less the cost of transportation to the nearest terminal, even though a railroad or commercial truck never handled the corn.

This has been a rather sketchy recital and I want to summarize my own impressions of the problem before us.

Two decades ago, we saw the rise of apparent agricultural surpluses and rushed in to cure the problem with legislation.

A decade later, we encounter another depression, including the farmers, during which Congress rushed many diverse laws upon the books only to find that the balancing force of nature accomplished infinitely more than all the laws which Congress enacted.

Now we face a shortage instead of a surplus and once more the legislative tinkering will begin to solve the problem.

The problem is simple enough. It is production.

Whether we undertake to expand our farm domain and bring more acreage into cultivation or whether we undertake to get increased production out of each existing acre, the problem is precisely the same. It takes manpower, machinery, and good prices. This is neither mystical or magical. It is only common sense.

Yet manpower has been siphoned from the farms and adequate supplies of machinery have not been made available. How then shall we obtain increased production?

How much has been said about the "four freedoms." Others have added a fifth freedom called freedom of enterprise. Let's add one more. Let's include freedom for the farmer to produce—freedom from red tape, freedom from governmental restrictions and freedom from artificially generated forces which make it impossible for him to forecast from one day to another whether he will produce at a loss or a profit.

But notwithstanding the highest income on record in 1943; notwithstanding huge deposits, huge bond purchases, and a reduction in the available supply of goods and services, it is still proposed that we borrow money, buy whole crops of commodities, sell them at a price below the cost of purchase and charge the loss to the Federal Treasury. It is a bit ironical to think that people are buying bonds so that a portion of the general revenue can be employed to meet the losses which Government must take on the purchase and sale of commodities. What do you think?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MACKINAC CONFERENCE OR—MACKINAC BLACK-OUT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, no one enjoys the rhetoric and the eloquence of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] more than I do.

I would like for him, however, to be a little more specific in the proposals that he has in mind for curing our economic ills. I listened very carefully to his discussion of the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, which to my mind was the beginning and probably the outstanding blunder of all of them. I listened to his discussion of the creation of these various agencies and these various policies, most of which I opposed. I even opposed the creation of the O. P. A. I believed then, and I believe now, that if we had followed the same policy we followed during the last World War we would not have had all the embarrassing and harassing situations that have grown up in every nook and corner of the country, and that today we would have more unity and less confusion.

But the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in attributing all the ills to these various agencies overlooked the fact that in 1921 when his party had a majority of 169 members in this House and 23 in the Senate they imposed the highest protective tariff law ever known up to that time, in the history of mankind. It paralyzed agriculture to such an extent that it drove those sections of the country that must compete with the rest of the world into a state of bankruptcy to begin with. It provoked on the part of Great Britain the Beaverbrook tariff, sponsored, fostered, and pushed by Lord Beaverbrook who has just been appointed Ambassador to Russia, that virtually killed our trade with that country.

What was the result of those tariff policies? You had a tariff of 42 cents a bushel on wheat when we shipped out more wheat than we were shipping in and when wheat was 10 cents a bushel higher in Winnipeg, Canada, than it was in Minneapolis, Minn., just across the line. If you are going back to those paralyzing policies, under which the world became a barbed-wire entanglement of tariff barriers, behind which world trade became stagnant and world commerce became paralyzed, then I say that our struggles will have been in vain. It was only a short time after the passage of the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act until almost every country in the world retaliated against us. They first created the United States of Europe, consisting of some 23 nations. That was before Hitler and Mussolini broke out. They not only put on retaliatory tariffs, but they put on quotas, license requirements, and inspection fees, and then required that when you shipped American grain into those countries you had to mix 25 percent American grain with 75 percent native grain, making it virtually impossible for us to do business with the rest of the world.

When Mr. Hoover was elected in 1928, the situation was not improved. Let me say here that I have great admiration for Herbert Hoover as a man and as an American. I would not say anything to detract from his good name. However, he had never served in either House of Congress and seemed to take advice from someone on the outside who did not understand the cause of our troubles. Somebody talked him into advocating raising the tariff and making the statement that we were going to supply the rest of the world with manufactured goods.

Then Congress proceeded to pass the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, adding another load that broke the camel's back, and we had the crash of 1929 that continued until 1932. I will admit that the program that was adopted to try to cure it was wrong. We should have put recovery ahead of reform. That is what I wanted to do. I was coauthor of the Thomas-Rankin bill to give the President the power to issue \$3,000,000,000 in currency against the gold we had. We had ample gold, and still have. As a matter of fact, we had practically 60 percent of the world supply of monetary gold. If he had issued \$3,000,000,000 in currency against that gold and put it into circulation, then all these attempts to reform human nature, reverse the law of supply and demand and change or abolish our economic system would not have been necessary.

The country would have recovered its prosperity almost overnight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman that in the first place I do not defend a great many of the things that have been done heretofore. The gentleman asked for a specific remedy. Why do we not let the Commodity Credit Corporation proceed with the authority they had in the first instance when created in 1933 to make loans to farmers so that they could hold their stuff, and let it go at that, instead of trying to inject a subsidy program at this time that will cost additional billions of borrowed money?

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that I took a good deal of abuse here because I opposed the bill that provided for killing pigs and plowing up cotton. Nothing ever hurt me worse than when I saw them go into my own field and plow up cotton that was already matured and open; because I realized that we were flying in the face of the economic laws, the laws of nature, and the laws of God. I have never been in favor of destroying anything in order to try to boost the price.

Here are two philosophies: First there is the philosophy of abundance, that has been preached to us by wise men since Biblical times, even by Moses himself. All through Holy Writ and down through the ages of history you will find that wise men have advocated the philosophy of abundance. On the other hand, you have the philosophy of scarcity, that has been advocated by a little selfish group—and I must say to the gen-

tleman from Illinois that your high protective tariff advocates fall within that category—the philosophy of squeezing production, squeezing supply, in order to raise prices, and benefit certain individuals or certain interests.

That is the line of demarcation today. On one side of it you have regimentation and scarcity; on the other side you have freedom and abundance.

Talk about the "four freedoms." One commentator said the other night that every convict in the penitentiary in his State had the "four freedoms." He had freedom from fear, because, he said, no matter how badly his enemies hated him they could not get in there to do anything to him. You know, the penitentiary sometimes is a great storm cellar for certain individuals.

He said the convict had freedom from want, because he could get all he wanted to eat and all he needed to wear. He said he had freedom of speech. He could say anything he pleased and nobody paid any attention to him. He said he had freedom of worship. He could pray to any God he wanted to, worship in any religion, and pray just as loudly and just as long as he pleased, and that he had a chaplain to assist him and a Bible to go by.

But the fifth freedom, the freedom to work, the freedom to conduct your own affairs, liberty if you please, is the freedom that Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Patrick Henry, and Alexander Hamilton had in mind.

Whenever you impose a restriction, whether through a high protective tariff or the O. P. A., that unnecessarily cuts down production or distribution and imposes a policy of scarcity, on a nation of abundance, then you depart from those fundamental principles upon which this Nation must stand if it is to continue to be a great leader among the countries of mankind.

ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Now I want to talk to you just a moment about the greatest economic issue this country has ever seen, as far as the masses of our people are concerned, and that is the power issue. I read all the reports from Mackinac. Of course, I was familiar with the record of One World Willkie, the one-time fashion plate of the Power Trust, who now presumes to be a second Lincoln. I was familiar with his record, because I had fought him up and down the Tennessee Valley, and throughout north Mississippi, and especially in my own district, just as I have fought in the Electric Bond & Share up and down the Columbia River.

I know that we are moving into an electric age. I know that it is the greatest economic issue confronting the American people. Yet you had 19 Republican Governors at the Mackinac conference. The people of the States over which those Governors preside were overcharged for their electricity in 1942 amounts ranging from \$185,000,000 in New York down to \$3,534,665 a year in the State of Vermont. I will put the complete figures in the Record and name

them by States and name the Governor of each State.

CALIFORNIA

The State of California was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Earl Warren.

In 1942 the people of the State of California were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$45,853,921, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$61,700,088, according to the Ontario rates.

COLORADO

The State of Colorado was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. John Vivian.

In 1942 the people of the State of Colorado were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$10,032,575, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$11,493,451, according to the Ontario rates.

CONNECTICUT

The State of Connecticut was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Raymond Baldwin.

In 1942 the people of the State of Connecticut were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$24,868,268, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$28,442,103, according to the Ontario rates.

DELAWARE

The State of Delaware was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Walter Bacon.

In 1942 the people of the State of Delaware were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$3,116,365, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$3,565,713, according to the Ontario rates.

IDAHO

The State of Idaho was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. C. A. Bottolfsen.

In 1942 the people of the State of Idaho were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$4,548,908, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$4,465,659, according to the Ontario rates.

ILLINOIS

The State of Illinois was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Dwight Green.

In 1942 the people of the State of Illinois were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$92,319,678, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$105,274,784, according to the Ontario rates.

IOWA

The State of Iowa was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Bourke Hickenlooper.

In 1942 the people of the State of Iowa were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$20,999,241, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$24,164,248, according to the Ontario rates.

MAINE

The State of Maine was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Sumner Sewall.

In 1942 the people of the State of Maine were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$8,500,739, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$9,694,372, according to the Ontario rates.

MASSACHUSETTS

The State of Massachusetts was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Leverett Saltonstall.

In 1942 the people of the State of Massachusetts were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$56,630,318, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$63,566,574, according to the Ontario rates.

MICHIGAN

The State of Michigan was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Harry Kelly.

In 1942 the people of Michigan were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$57,607,112, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$69,348,138, according to the Ontario rates.

MINNESOTA

The State of Minnesota was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Edward Thye.

In 1942 the people of the State of Minnesota were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$24,337,522, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$28,274,784, according to the Ontario rates.

MISSOURI

The State of Missouri was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. F. C. Donnell.

In 1942 the people of the State of Missouri were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$27,230,943, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$32,175,217, according to the Ontario rates.

MONTANA

The State of Montana was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Sam Ford.

In 1942 the people of the State of Montana were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$4,989,702, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$6,044,851, according to the Ontario rates.

NEBRASKA

The State of Nebraska was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Dwight Griswold.

In 1942 the people of the State of Nebraska were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$8,515,120, according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$9,993,975, according to the Ontario rates.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The State of New Hampshire was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Robert Blood.

In 1942 the people of the State of New Hampshire were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$5,825,127, according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$6,623,623, according to the Ontario rates.

NEW YORK

The State of New York was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey.

In 1942 the people of the State of New York were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$185,460,625, according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$206,608,500, according to the Ontario rates.

OHIO

The State of Ohio was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. John W. Bricker.

In 1942 the people of the State of Ohio were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$69,270,721, according to the

T. V. A. rates, and \$82,776,491, according to the Ontario rates.

OREGON

The State of Oregon was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Earl Snell.

In 1942 the people of the State of Oregon were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$7,127,731, according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$9,605,692 according to the Ontario rates.

PENNSYLVANIA

The State of Pennsylvania was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Edward Martin.

In 1942 the people of the State of Pennsylvania were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$95,175,358 according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$112,773,228 according to the Ontario rates.

SOUTH DAKOTA

The State of South Dakota was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. M. Q. Sharpe.

In 1942 the people of the State of South Dakota were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$4,191,208 according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$4,652,372 according to the Ontario rates.

VERMONT

The State of Vermont was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. William Willis.

In 1942 the people of the State of Vermont were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$3,534,665 according to the T. V. A. rates, and \$4,051,758 according to the Ontario rates.

WISCONSIN

The State of Wisconsin was represented at the Mackinac conference by Gov. Andrew Goodland.

In 1942 the people of the State of Wisconsin were overcharged for their electric lights and power \$29,477,511, according to the T. V. A. rates; and \$34,147,079, according to the Ontario rates.

CONCLUSION

What do these Governors propose for the relief of these overburdened power consumers in their respective States?

What does the Republican Party as a whole propose to do?

These are questions that must be answered unless the Mackinac conference is to go down in history as the Mackinac black-out.

Every State in this Union is financially better off than is the Federal Government. There is not a man here who will rise to deny that statement. These Governors all boast that their States are solvent, that they have money in the treasury. Many of them do not owe a dollar. Yet, not a one of those Governors raised his voice, as far as I have ever been able to find, in the interests of the power consumers of their own States, and not one of them has offered to aid in this great program of rural electrification.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly will; and if the gentleman can point out one of these Governors who made any statement on

the power question, I certainly would be glad to have his name.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my friend from Mississippi that there really was no occasion to say anything particular, for this reason.

Mr. RANKIN. They talked about everything else, pertaining to the farmers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman wants the facts?

Mr. RANKIN. All right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There was one general statement on foreign policy. There was a general statement on domestic policy. It was left to the various subcommittees that were created to spell out the various items for the agenda of those various subcommittees.

Mr. RANKIN. In those various reports that I read—and they were put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD here—you discussed everything pertaining to the farmer except the one thing in which he is most vitally interested, and that is rural electrification. I am not quarreling with the gentleman from Illinois, for he is not a governor; but I want to get him straight before he gets too far off the track.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I just want to make clear that there was a statement to the general effect that they wanted to preserve the freedom of the American farmer and supply him with the instrumentalities that are necessary to a decent living and effective production. It was not the purpose of that council to go any further than that. The specific recommendation will be made at some subsequent time.

Mr. RANKIN. If their statements on these issues are as innocuous or as silent in the future, they might as well not go to the farmers of the country, because those farmers are more interested in rural electrification than in anything else that has been advocated in your day and mine.

When first I came to Congress, back in those glorious days when the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act was levying a tax on everything the farmer bought, from the swaddling clothes of infancy to the lining of the coffin in which old age was laid away, during those boom days of alleged Harding-Coolidge prosperity, the American people were using 40,000,000,000 kilowatts of electricity a year. This year, 1943, they will use 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or five times as much. My prediction is that unless some selfish interests get control and continue to strangle the American people with exorbitant rates, within 10 years after the close of this war they will be using 500,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. We have 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of annual production of undeveloped water power now going to waste, flowing wanton to the sea, for which we get absolutely nothing. We could harness that water power, give the people the benefit of it, and make it pay for its development in a generation.

I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am not seeking personal credit. Some people have exerted themselves very much to keep me from getting credit even for my coauthorship of the act creating the Tennessee Valley

Authority. I noticed the other day a great deal of publicity about who was responsible for raising the soldiers' pay to \$50 a month. Everybody in the House, and all the soldiers, know that I not only introduced that amendment but stayed with it and fought it through. I started the rural electrification fight in my own district, in my home county. We worked out a program that has been adopted and spread to the rest of the country. These cooperative associations are independent; they are not subject to control by any Federal agency. They are controlled by the farmers themselves. In 1935, 2 years after I started this rural electrification program, we had only 10 percent of our farms electrified—and they were largely suburban farms, near town. Germany had 90 percent, Sweden and Norway had 90 percent, France and Italy had 94 percent, Holland and Switzerland had 100 percent of their farms electrified at that time, and even Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified. New Zealand, a far-away, new, and sparsely settled country, had 65 percent of her farms electrified. After 8 years of hard struggle in which we have been joined by farmers, Democrats, Republicans, and independents in every State in this Union, our program has been carried on without regard to party politics, and we have raised the percentage of American farms electrified from 10 percent to 38 percent.

If we are going to have independent farmers in the years to come, if we are going to have farmers who are to enjoy the comforts and conveniences of modern life, everything from electric lights to electric irons, electric fans, radios, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, refrigerators, water pumps, milking machines and cold-storage facilities, and all the other conveniences that electricity will bring, I submit we are going to have to have a more pronounced and positive policy than I found in the reports of the Mackinac conference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech made by Mr. Bruce K. Brown.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Hon. Josephus Daniels on September 26 entitled "Congress and the Peace."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WORLD-WIDE AVIATION

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS] has requested that this telegram from Donald W. Douglas, of the Douglas Aircraft Co., which is in his congressional district, be placed in the RECORD as an extension of remarks.

With the permission of the House, I shall read the telegram at this time:

SANTA MONICA, CALIF., September 21, 1943.

S. J. SOLOMON,
Chairman, Airlines Committee for
United States Air Policy,
Washington, D. C.:

You have my permission to release contents of my letter September 13 which read as follows:

"I have studied with great interest the declaration of policy of world-wide aviation as advocated by the 16 signatory air lines. It is my firm belief that the basic policy involving free competition under reasonable governmental regulation will be necessary to insure the development of a sound and efficient post-war foreign air-line system. I pledge my active support to the over-all effort now being put forth to assure American supremacy in international air-line operation through the American principle of competition."

DONALD W. DOUGLAS,
Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this telegram may be included in the Appendix as the extension of remarks of the gentleman from California, Mr. WILL ROGERS, JR.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VURSELL was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BURCH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. BLAND), indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 5, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Tuesday, October 5, 1943, at 11 a. m., to begin hearings on projects being considered for inclusion in an omnibus river and harbor bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, October 6, 1943, on H. R. 2701 and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on Thursday, October 7, 1943, on general bills.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct further hearings on H. R. 2857, a bill to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, at 10

a. m., on Monday, October 11, 1943, in room 346, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS

The Committee on Pensions will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 2350. A bill to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

H. R. 2784. A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, to certain maimed soldiers, to certain widows, minor children, and helpless children of such soldiers and sailors, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1926.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 12, 1943, at 10 a. m.

At that time consideration will be given to the following bills:

H. R. 3257. A bill to amend subtitle—insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The purposes of the bill is to affirm and clarify the authority of the W. S. A. to agree to a waiver of the statute of limitations in connection with claims arising from insurance agreements in case of missing vessels, in order to provide for prompt settlement of both marine risks and war risks involved.

H. R. 3258. A bill to prevent double recovery on claims under section 1 (a) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to seamen employed by the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to limit the possibility of double or overlapping recovery on account of death or injury of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the W. S. A. The possibility of such overlapping recovery arises in cases of seamen who are entitled to sue under the law of the United States in case of death or injury and may also be entitled to sue under foreign law on account of the same casualty.

H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The purpose of the bill is to exclude from consideration for the purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, services of seamen employed as employees of the United States by the U. S. A. on foreign-flag vessels or contracted for and performed wholly outside the United States, so that the coverage for such benefits for seamen employees of the W. S. A. shall be in line with the coverage in case of similar services by seamen employed by private shipping operators.

H. R. 3260. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for requisition or purchase of vessels owned by subsidiaries of American corporations.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the requisition or purchase under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, of vessels owned by American concerns through foreign subsidiaries but which are not owned by United States citizens within the terms of the Merchant Marine Act and which are not idle foreign vessels within the terms of the act of June 6, 1941—Public, No. 101, Seventy-seventh Congress.

H. R. 3261. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is, by amending Public Law 44, Seventy-eighth Congress, to authorize the return of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less which are owned by the United States under the procedure of Public Law 44 for the return to private ownership of vessels to which the United States has title which are no longer needed in the war effort.

H. R. 3262. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to expressly authorize the waiver of recovery of seamen's insurance payments by the W. S. A. particularly in cases where insurance has been paid to beneficiaries on the assumption that the missing seamen were dead, but later are found to be alive. The bill follows a similar provision with respect to recovery of benefits paid by the Veterans' Administration.

House Joint Resolution 158. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for a Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy similar to that provided for the United States Coast Guard Academy.

House Joint Resolution 161. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration to pay cash awards for suggestions received from employees to increase efficiency or improve the functioning of the agencies.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, October 19, 1943, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 3334, to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

775. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for their payment, amounting to \$84,991.83 (H. Doc. No. 312); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

776. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a record of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which requires an appropriation of \$3,178.83 together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 313); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

777. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, in the sum of \$12,997.86, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (34 U. S. C. 599), and which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 314); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

778. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the War Manpower Commission of the Office of Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$17,043,000 (H. Doc. No. 315); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

779. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, amounting to \$17,546,700 (H. Doc. No. 316); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

780. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to \$2,880.82, as covered by a certificate of settlement, the number of which is shown in the first column of the attached schedule (H. Doc. No. 317); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

781. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Federal Security Agency to pay a claim for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the Public Health Service, in the sum of \$60, which has been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of June 15, 1936 (14 U. S. C. 71), and which requires an appropriation for payment (H. Doc. No. 318); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

782. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of \$10,705.19 together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 319); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

783. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 for the Department of Commerce (Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics), amounting to \$3,081,000 (H. Doc. No. 320); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

784. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supple-

mental estimates of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$4,427,550 (H. Doc. No. 321); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

785. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a schedule of claims amounting to \$517,126.42, allowed by the General Accounting Office, as covered by certificates of settlement the numbers of which are shown in the first column of said schedule under appropriations, the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and for the services of the several departments and independent establishments (H. Doc. No. 322); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

786. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of Justice to pay claims for damages to privately owned property in the sum of \$253.58 which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of March 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1184), and which requires an appropriation for its payment (H. Doc. No. 323); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

787. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the United States Coast Guard, in the sum of \$3,061.09, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of June 15, 1936 (14 U. S. C. 71), and which require an appropriation for payment (H. Doc. No. 324); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

788. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent establishments to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of \$22,622.70, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), and which require appropriations for their payment (H. Doc. No. 325); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

789. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

790. A letter from the Chairman, War Shipping Administration and United States Maritime Commission, transmitting quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for the period ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

791. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of determinations made by him during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1944 as to the numbers of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the executive departments and agencies; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

792. A letter from the Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a form setting forth information in response to questions Nos. 1 and 5, in accordance with instructions in Bureau of the Budget Circular No. 421 of May 31, 1943, for the use of the Bureau in determining the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics during the period October 1, 1943, to December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

793. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting copy of the estimate of personnel requirements of the United States Tariff Commission for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

794. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for The National Archives for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

795. A letter from William H. McReynolds, administrative assistant to the President, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the Liaison Office for Personnel Management for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

796. A letter from the Commissioner of the Budget, transmitting the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the Office of Budget and Administrative Planning, Migratory Bird, and Expenses of Loans, supplementing the estimates sent under date of September 28, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

797. A letter from the Chairman, War Manpower Commission, transmitting Bureau of the Budget Forms No. 80-R-001.1 for the War Manpower Commission, exclusive of the Bureau of Selective Service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

798. A letter from Frank K. Sanderson, administrative officer, the White House, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the White House office; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

799. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting an estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

800. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting copies of supplemental materials which were presented to the Bureau of the Budget in support of requests for personnel needs during the first quarter of fiscal 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

801. A letter from the Director, Office of Censorship, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Censorship for the quarter ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

802. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the National Labor Relations Board for the second quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

803. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Strategic Services, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Strategic Services; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3374. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey, on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1 of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage Townsite, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3375. A bill to support the price of cotton at 40 cents per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3376. A bill to provide that during the present war all persons in the armed

forces shall have in force national service life insurance in the amount of \$5,000 without the payment of premiums, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 3377. A bill to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from \$40 to \$50 per month, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 3378. A bill to authorize the purchase of certain lands for addition to the Navajo Indian Reservation in New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 3379. A bill to codify the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 3380. A bill to provide for the issuance and award of a Civil Air Patrol Medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3381. A bill relating to credits against the victory tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 3382. A bill to enable disabled veterans to accept employment during the war period without deductions from their pensions or compensation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3383. A bill providing for the refund of penalties paid with respect to marketing excess wheat for the 1941 marketing year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 3384. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept property for the Moores Creek National Military Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 3385. A bill for the relief of Mary Keegan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 3386. A bill for the relief of Robert Caven; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland:

H. R. 3387. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 3388. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3389. A bill for the relief of William R. Weathers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 3390. A bill for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and for the three children of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the late William Edward Cothron, namely, Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAFOLLETTE:

H. R. 3391. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judith H. Sedler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3392. A bill for the relief of Gladys Mary White; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3393. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred G. Crane; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2640. By Mr. FLOESER: Petition of H. C. Mueller's liquor store and 45 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2641. Also, petition of Emil W. Mueller and 22 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2642. Also, petition of Peter Yanczer and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2643. Also, petition of William J. Hemmen and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2644. Also, petition of George J. Amsler and 24 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2645. Also, petition of Joseph L. Gobbert and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2646. Also, petition of Herman F. Prange and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2647. Also, petition of Paul V. Neidhart and 16 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2648. Also, petition of Edward C. Bolm, Sr., and 22 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2649. Also, petition of Norman Cook and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2650. Also, petition of John F. Telthorst and 23 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2651. Also, petition of Christanich Anton and 24 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., opposing any enactment of House bill 2082, known as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2652. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communications from B. K. Leach, of St. Louis, Mo., Allen K. Swann, of Evansville, and Walter Duncan, Jr., of Mount Vernon, Ill., favoring the immediate passage of House bill 3203, providing for an increase in the price of crude oil in order to stimulate the much-needed production of same; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2653. Also, resolution unanimously adopted by the Rotary Club of Albion, Ill., urging the immediate consideration of House bill 3203, providing for an increase in the price of crude petroleum; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2654. Also, communication from Jarvis Bros. and Marcell, of Decatur, Ill., supporting House bill 3203, in order to stimulate the much-needed production of oil; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2655. Also communication from G. C. Curtis, superintendent of oil conservation of Illinois, urging the adoption of House bill 3203, providing for an increase in the price of crude oil; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2656. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Theodore H. Kefrig of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2657. Also, petition of Angelo Stargars and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2658. Also, petition of John William Hoemeke and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2659. Also, petition of Mary Capstick, of Normandy, Mo., and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2660. Also, petition of employees of Procter & Gamble, St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2261. Also, petition of the United Shoe Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Local 56A, and signed by 124 St. Louis citizens, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2662. Also, petition of Elmer E. Taylor, of St. Louis, Mo., and 45 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2663. Also, petition of Bernard Kauling, of St. Louis, Mo., and 19 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2664. Also, petition of George E. Wilhelm and 40 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2665. Also, petition of Richard S. Lowe, of St. Louis, Mo., and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2666. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. Arthur Neiderbeiser, president, the Ruth Bible class of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Holidays Cove and Weirton, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2667. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco City and County Federation of Women's Clubs, relative to national sugar emergency, and urging Congress to exert full efforts to bring about an announcement by the War Food Administration of an effective program and policy as regards beet sugar, on or before October 1, 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2668. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of Lewis Nelson, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and 27 petitioners, protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082, or any other legislation having for its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2669. Also, petition of the F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., and 154 petitioners, protesting against the consideration or enactment of House bill 2082, or any other legislation having for its purpose the reenactment of prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2670. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of Martin D. Liss and 69 others, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2671. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Pratt, Kans., favoring the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1943

(Legislative day of Wednesday, September 15, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who dost overarch our fleeting years with Thine eternity and dost undergird our weakness with Thy strength, at the day's beginning we pause to bow our hearts at this shrine of our spirits. We would silence tense emotions, calm stormy passions, that we may be still and know that Thou art God. Without Thee even our radiant hopes for humanity are like withered leaves—once bright with sunshine which change to brown and crumpled ruins, blown upon a bitter wind.

O God, save us from succumbing to the terrible temptation to be men of lost faith. Help us to see that way madness lies and the surrender of all that gives life worth and loveliness and grace. Join us in spirit to those who in other times that tried men's souls went on believing in beauty and love and God in the midst of ugliness, hatred, and horror. For, as in humility we turn to Thee, we remember that we date this day's deliberations from the lowly cradle of one who died on a cruel cross, mocked, reviled, insulted, outraged; yet that cross of torture sways the future. By its crimson sign may we conquer. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 4, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 378) to provide for the addition of certain land in the State of Arizona to the Montezuma Castle National Monument, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 149. An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids;

H. R. 340. An act to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to grant and